



THE STRATFORD BUST, FROM DUGDALE'S WARWICKSHIRE,
PUBLISHED 1656.



THE STRATFORD BUST AS IT IS TODAY

BACONIANA

VOL. XL (71st Year)

No. 155

NOVEMBER, 1956

It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.

EDITORIAL

"It may therefore be said of me, as was once said in jest, since it hits the distinction so truly: It cannot be that they should think alike, when one drinks water and the other drinks wine." Now others, both ancient and modern, have in the Sciences drunk a crude liquor like water, either flowing spontaneously from the Intellect, or drawn up by Logic as by wheels from a well. Whereas I pledge mankind in a liquor strained from countless grapes, ripe and well-seasoned and collected in clusters, squeezed in the press and clarified in the vat. It is therefore no wonder they and I do not think alike."

(Novum Organum I. (123))

* * * *

We have been asked if we would sometimes preface our editorial columns with a quotation from Bacon, irrespective of whether we wish to comment upon it or not, and we thought it well to accede to this request. The above passage will bear many interpretations, but it occurs in a part of the *Novum Organum*, which suggests that Bacon is referring to his method of approaching truth by a free examination of "things themselves", by sifting the evidence.

One of the greatest dangers to our present civilization lies in the deliberate misrepresentation of news. In his book "Pax Britannica", the historian Voigt expresses this danger in a pregnant sentence: "The war of mastery over the world of "words" and the war for the mastery over the world of "things" are one war. . . . Traitors profess "patriotism", and patriots are put to death as "traitors". Intermediate words have been invented so that truth can more easily slide into falsehood. . . . the word "collaborator" is one of these; a word much favoured among modern malignants. Unpopular tyrannies call themselves "popular" and force the people to acclaim them. The people are robbed of their rights in the name of "the People"."

What would strike Francis Bacon most forcibly, if he were to revisit the European scene today, would be our elaborate machinery for the manipulation and colouring of facts. For that, in effect, is what is done by the processes of "propaganda" and "indoctrination". Modern news agencies and broadcasting systems are mostly tied down to one party line or another. In some countries there is only one Party line, from which any "deviationism" is a capital offence. In other countries, there may be two or three Party lines between which the allegiance of the daily Press is exclusively divided. Doctoring and colouring various items of news has come to be accepted as a matter of course. Rare indeed is the daily newspaper that does not suffer from "policy" control, although monthly and weekly journals breathe in a less repressive atmosphere. The elimination of falsehood and error—of the idols of mind—was one of the first objects of the Great Instauration. To Francis Bacon truth was not so much a thing capable of possession by anyone, as a goal.

It is in the realm of what we now call "pure science" that Bacon's methods have largely prevailed, and that available facts are impartially sifted or, to use his own picturesque phrase: "collected in clusters, squeezed in the press and clarified in the vat." In the realm of politics, and in much academic discussion, this is far from being the case; the aim is not so much to squeeze the facts and elicit the truth as to select certain facts and colour and magnify them so that they may bear a preconceived interpretation. Such an interpretation is often carefully nursed until it reaches the stature of an ideology which can be used to stimulate the passions and bias the judgement.

The basic theme of the *Novum Organum* (as well as the general trend of all Bacon's works) was to clear the mind of false idols and to secure the evidence of true facts and worthy ideals by paying due attention to the "prerogative instances". How far we have strayed from this method in the political sphere is reflected in the chaotic unrest of today. Half the world is forced to bow the knee to some man-made secular religion dignified by the name of "ideology". Any method of coercion, including the dreadful process of "brain-washing", is regarded as legitimate in some countries. In our own country we can perhaps sing (with Stephano and Trinculo!) that "thought is free", but can we claim that our classical education is as free from bias as our so-called "scientific" education? Does not tradition sometimes divert us from the truth? And is there not often a tinge of indoctrination in what should literally be education? From Bacon's point of view, the trouble with our so-called "classical" forms of education is that they are not yet truly scientific!

How then are we to reconcile the Baconian strictness and severity in search of truth with those historical inaccuracies in the Shakespearean plays? The answer is clearly given in the *Advancement of Learning* where Bacon introduces his "Georgics of the Mind", and in the *Novum Organum* where he states that the fourth part of his Instauration will contain "Tables of Invention for Anger, Fear, and Shame." Note this word "invention", for this is entirely separate

from the historical and scientific facts to be accurately assembled in the third part of the Instauration.

Of the fourth part of the Instauration, which Bacon defined broadly as "the method of the mind in the Comprehension of things exemplified", the Shakespeare Plays would form only a fragment. But it is in these unique plays that the conflicting desires and emotions of mankind are truly "exemplified"; and they provide an understanding of life which in the ordinary way would require the experience of many lifetimes. The student of occult wisdom will find a valuable field for mental exercise here in the Georgics of the Mind, where the "initiative" method of teaching is accomplished dramatically. As to that more scientific pursuit of Truth, which Bacon declared to be the "sovereign good of human nature", even he had some misgivings as to its direct impact on the human mind.....

*"But I cannot tell. This same Truth is a
naked and open Daylight that doth not shew
the Masques and Mummeries and Triumphs of the world
half so stately and daintily as candlelights."*

* * * *

We must congratulate Mr. Eagle on the skilful way in which, without mentioning Bacon at all, he aroused the interest of correspondents of the "Daily Telegraph" on the question of the authenticity of the Stratford bust. Our readers will find this sequence of letters re-printed on a later page. We trust that publication of our effort to support him was not the reason for part of his final letter being pruned by the editor. Mr. Eagle has apparently led this correspondence as far as it will be permitted to go at present, and we regard the reproduction of the Dugdale sketch in the "Daily Telegraph" as a considerable achievement. It recalls the days in the Autumn of 1877 when the "Daily Telegraph" was the first important newspaper to do justice to our cause. As will be seen from our frontispiece the differences in the Monuments are numerous and marked, not only in detail but in design, and none but a dullard could fail to remark the vacuous expression on the face of the present figure. Mr. Edward Johnson in his pamphlet *A Short History of the Stratford "Shakespeare" Monument* includes some excellent illustrations of the present Bust, and that portrayed in Sir William Dugdale's *History of the Antiquities of Warwickshire*.

* * * *

A friend of long standing, Count Randwyck, has kindly sent us photostats of Dr. Speckman's booklet, printed in Germany, and entitled *Francis Bacon und sein Tod in Stuttgart in Jahre, 1647*, and of letters no. 190 and 202 by Joh. Val. Andreae, addressed to the Princes of Brunswick. The originals of the letters are included in the collection in the Royal Library at the Hague, *Augustalia Seleniana incepta*. Count Randwyck points out that these letters were irregularly numbered since that dated 26th February, 1647 is no. 202, and that headed 22nd December 1647 is no. 190. One hundred and ninety is

a significant figure according to the explanation given in the article by the Count which appears elsewhere in this issue.

* * * * *

We are pleased to re-print in this issue a translation by Professor Henrion of what is still the first known "Life of Bacon" ever to have been published. This "Discours de la vie de Mon. Bacon" (which was ably commented upon in "Baconiana" in 1916) appeared in 1631, pre-fixed to the French "Histoire Naturelle"—a book which differs considerably from its English counterpart "Sylva Sylvarum." It preceded Rawley's "Life of Bacon" by about twenty-six years. There are several curious points to which attention was first drawn by Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame and the Rev. Walter Begley, and we think a few of these will bear repeating.

Firstly, this "Life" is not alluded to by any of Bacon's recognised biographers: Rawley, Mallett, Montagu, Spedding, Robertson, Steevens, and others. Indeed, Spedding seems to have been oblivious of it.

Secondly, this "Life" is referred to and approved by Gilbert Watts in the 1640 English Edition of the *De Augmentis* as "a just and elegant discourse". So that Rawley, who was living at the time, must have known all about it, and must have deliberately avoided all reference to it. Moreover, since in his own preface he warns us that he will not "tread too near the heels of truth", we may conclude that he knew more than he cared to report.

Thirdly, the "Life" gives some support to the belief, entertained by some of our members that Bacon did not die in 1626, but may have been secretly conveyed out of the country. This, of course, we still regard as an open question concerning which readers must form their own opinions. Certainly it is rather unusual for a biographer—even in a short discourse—to omit all reference to the dates or places of either birth or death and even to the names of either parent! As Professor Henrion points out, all we have are rather vague references to "son pere" at the beginning while at the conclusion the words "mort" or "mourant" are not specifically used, though they are rather oddly implied, as follows:— "....reduce him to the last condition that is always reached by great men only too soon", and ".....thus ended this great man." As Professor Henrion indicates, when a biographer makes such a roundabout approach and uses a phrase such as "born among the purples", he raises doubts and invites enquiry. But since this is an open question on which our readers are divided, we refer them for the more orthodox view to Mr. Eagle's excellent article in "Baconiana" No. 153, and for the opposite opinion, to the articles of Granville C. Cuninghame and Parker Woodward in "Baconiana" for the years 1916/1917, and of course the present article by Professor Henrion.

* * * * *

We have been reminded that there is one side of our work in which all true Baconians could co-operate without disagreement. This is in the clearing of Lord Bacon's character and his vindication historically on the two great questions on which Macaulay slandered him,

i.e., his supposed ingratitude to Essex, and his supposed perversion of justice. This is a very different matter from attempting to make excuses for him, and is a worthy cause in which all who write for us could co-operate. In our next issue we hope to start the ball rolling by re-printing one of the most stimulating articles on this subject. Meantime we would remind readers of the excellent contribution *Francis Bacon's "Fall"*, by R. J. W. Gentry, dealing with a particular aspect of the subject, which appeared in *Baconiana* No. 151, of May 1955.

* * * * *

We have again expanded this number to fifty-two pages, as some compensation for the fact that owing to unavoidable delays, we have only been able to print two issues in the calendar year 1956. We hope to revert to three issues of forty-eight pages in 1957, but would stress that, as in the past, we must depend on continued financial support on a generous scale. Meanwhile the Editors wish to thank all subscribers, particularly those who have offered to pay a small extra contribution for their copies of *Baconiana*.

OBITUARY

It is with great regret that we record the passing on, on July 22nd, of Mrs. R. Knight. Greatly handicapped in later years by deafness and lameness, Mrs. Knight was unable to attend meetings, but was always a most interested reader of "Baconiana", and often used to help our cause by buying additional copies and sending them abroad to friends in Europe, India, and South America.

"R.K." as she will be affectionately remembered by many, was an accomplished linguist and her knowledge of the East was profound. She was formerly a close friend of Mr. A. P. Sinnett, the well-known theosophical author, and it was probably through him that she first became interested in the cause of Lord Bacon, when Mr. Sinnett expressed his views in the "National Review" of August 1901. R. K.'s interests were too wide and varied for any single Society or group to claim her as its own; but she was a "giving" person to all, and her kindness and wise counsel will long be remembered no less than her exceptional generosity in giving and lending books.

With the poet Walter Owen (one of our members in Argentina)) she became a firm friend, lightly calling him her "mental paramour". She kept up a continuous correspondence with him during his years of illness in Buenos Aires, thus easing for him the burden of a sick bed in a foreign land.

In her view, as in Walter Owen's, the event we call "death" was no more than a shift of consciousness, and in this profound belief she caused a few lines from his translation of "Don Juan Tenorio" to be specially sent to her friends at her passing. To "R.K." a poem, if it were a true one, was the property of all, and she strongly approved Lord Bacon's custom of allowing others to be credited with some of the fruits of his muse. We will, therefore, close this short and inadequate memoir by quoting those lines which had appealed to her:

"...Here at life's postern gate,
I feel the indraught of eternity,
And a new thrill of an intenser spirit
Invade this shell. I feel my senses open.
The world I lived in is the world of phantoms,
And men and women in it, walking ghosts,
Senseless and blind till Love illumine them. "

M.P.

A MEMOIR OF MR. HOWARD BRIDGEWATER

Howard Bridgewater was born in London in 1877 and died at the end of May 1956. He was the second son of Francis Bridgewater, Chairman of *The Financial Times*, and founder of *The Drapers' Record*. To a large extent, Howard followed in the business and journalistic footsteps of his father.

Educated at Bedford School, his early career in journalism was interrupted by a visit to South Africa for health reasons. A short employment at Johannesburg was overtaken by the Boer War, and he immediately enlisted in Col. Bethune's Mounted Infantry. He was captured and spent some time in a prisoner of war camp where, despite severe privations, he edited an amusing camp magazine written in an old exercise book and now in the United Services Museum.

Returning to England at the turn of the century, he spent a year at Heidelberg as secretary to a German merchant, thereafter returning to London to join his elder brother in the founding and management of *The Magazine of Commerce*. Later he joined his father at *The Financial Times*, becoming Advertisement Manager, and remained there until enlisting in the Royal Artillery during World War I. After the war he worked in various advertising offices before taking an appointment in Canada as secretary of a gold mining company, but after three years returned to England in 1925, becoming City Editor of *The Exchange Telegraph Company*. He remained in that position until his retirement in 1945.

Outside his work he had many interests and activities. It is noteworthy that at the age of thirty nine, after years of private intensive study, he was admitted to Gray's Inn as Barrister-at-Law. Although he never practised at the Bar he was always proud of this association with it.

He was passionately devoted to the works of Shakespeare and so became an enthusiastic Baconian. He became Chairman of the Council of the Society and was a frequent contributor to "Baconiana." Some of his articles have been reprinted in pamphlet form and a list of them can be found on the back of the cover of the magazine. In recent years he delved deeply into the archaeology of this country, and particularly studied the mysterious "Shell Temple" at Margate on which he wrote a small book and numerous articles. He was possessed of a keen sense of enquiry and adventure which led his mind into many fields.

Mr. Bridgewater is survived by his widow and son.

R.L.E.

FRANCIS BACON'S LIFE

By PIERRE AMBOISE (1631)

As translated by Professor Pierre Henrion

FOREWORD

In the following translation, I have endeavoured to keep literally to the French text of Pierre Amboise, while retaining the quaint rhetorical style then in fashion, with its long winded balanced periods. This interesting discourse is prefixed to the first French edition of Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* and *New Atlantis*, 1631, the title page of which reads as follows: —

*Histoire Naturelle/de/Mre. Francois Bacon, Baron de Verulam
Vicomte de Saint/ Alban, &Chancelier d'Angleterre / A Paris
chez Antoine de Somnaville / & Andre Soubron, associez, / au
Palais dans la petite Salle / M. DC. XXXI. / Avec Privilege
du Roy.*

I have italicized certain passages in my translation of this revealing discourse because one or two things deserve to be specially considered as follows. :—

1. Amboise being constantly eulogistic, the critical reader might conclude that his testimony is biased, that of a blind panegyrist or at least of a man too strictly applying the principle of *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*; the dead—or supposed dead—are not to be ill spoken of. But, on closer inspection, it will be seen that Amboise, if sometimes naïve, is always sincere. Thus, where he could have been simply diplomatic and non-committal about Bacon's fall, he is frankly indignant.

2. Bearing in mind the flatteries of the prefaces and "epistles dedicatory" of the times (including some signed Bacon and some Shakespeare) Amboise's little introductory piece sounds sober indeed. His anxiety to praise may sometimes rise to the point of using the noble superlative, but never to the point of distortion. Whatever flatteries he indulges in appear as a mild form of *vitium temporis* not as *vitium hominis*. So that by the standards of his time, the man may be pronounced trustworthy.

Just before his discourse appears an "Ode de Mr. Auvray, advocat au Parlement". Of this we shall not bother to give a translation, as it is spoilt by the said *vitium temporis*. This stylistic effort in empty blandiloquence could apply to any man. By contrast, Amboise's testimony takes on a fuller value and appears singularly well-documented.

One thing only from Auvray's ode is worth mentioning. He wonders how a foreigner could be so greatly favoured in Paris by everybody. This universal appeal of Bacon is food for thought: a great pity it is that Macaulay did not live in Bacon's time!

3. In contrast with Auvray, Amboise appears as a well informed man. Some of his details may perhaps be questioned, but on the whole the picture he gives is valid, and drawn with a good sense of perspective. Here again, of course, we must place the author in his

own time; and then I think his account of undisputed facts will enable us to give credit to what he says regarding disputed facts.

4. The first disputed fact is Bacon's origin. Unless I am greatly mistaken, what we know of the antecedents of the excellent Sir Nicholas could hardly justify the phrase that Francis, "born amid the purples" should feel bound to show himself worthy of "the splendour of his race", a race that had left "so many marks of greatness in History". Would not this describe the Tudors rather than the Bacons? How could Francis, simply because he was of the race of Sir Nicholas, see himself destined "to hold the helm of the kingdom"?

Let us look at the mystery the other way round. Let us suppose that Francis was of royal lineage. This dangerous secret of state would be more freely hinted at in a foreign country than in England where such matters were too hot to bear more than timid *sub rosa* whisperings and cryptographical recordings. The foreigner at once more tempted and more free to give a hint, would not say less, but could hardly say more than Amboise, for even he had to consider his *privilege du Roy* (licence to publish) and it might well have been cancelled. For there are tacit conventions in such tidings, based on a sort of freemasonry of the great and on an implied threat of retaliation: "don't touch the legend of Elizabeth and you can count on us gentlemen not to touch (let us say) your Joan of Arc". The "splendour of the race" of the man "born amid the purples" (a rather timid variation on the normal born *in the purple*), the man who, from his very youth, could "see himself destined to hold the helm of the Kingdom", those were the greatest lengths to which a discreet author could safely venture!

5. Another disputed fact, frankly and unambiguously tackled by Amboise, is Bacon's guilt. He does not extenuate, or excuse, he simply exculpates. His conclusion is: the fickleness of fortune, and the 'brutal' ingratitude of England. Here again, it is to be regretted that Macaulay did not know about Amboise—any more than about the equally exculpatory *Vita* prefixed to the *Opera Omnia* published at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1665 (which even Spedding missed)—Bacon's downfall being ascribed here again to no other cause than malevolence "*alia, nisi Invidia procurante, cause non factum est*",—this under the title *obstrectiones*, or malicious attacks.

6. Another point will be of interest to students of Bacon and Shakespeare. Amboise says emphatically that not only France but Italy and Spain were visited by Francis. This accounts for the extraordinary *couleur locale* and the inexplicable knowledge of unpublished accurate local details found in Shakespeare's Italian plays. And lastly, though Amboise does not refer to it, Bacon in this first French "translation" of the *Sylva Sylvarum*, mentions certain things not in the original, among them a visit to Scotland of which there is no other record.

Once the reader gets used to Ambroise's style, I hope he will find his biographical sketch pleasant reading. With the above points in mind, I believe he will even find it suggestive and enlightening.

A DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE OF MR. FRANCIS BACON, CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND

by PIERRE AMBOISE, Escuyer, Sieur de La Magdelaine (1631)

THOSE who have known the excellence of Mr. Bacon's mind through reading of his works will, I believe, be eager to learn what sort of a man he was, and to hear that Fortune did not forget to give due reward to merits as rare and extraordinary as his. True, she lavished her affections on his youth rather than on his age, for his life had very happy beginnings, but an end so rough and strange that you will be astounded¹ when you presently see the chief Minister of the State of England, a man great by birth and great by estate, brought to such reduced circumstances that he lacked the very necessities of life.

I find it difficult to conform to the vulgar opinion which maintains that great men cannot conceive children comparable to themselves, as if nature on that point was inferior to art which easily succeeds in achieving a good likeness in a portrait. Besides, Histories show us that the most eminent persons have often found in their families children that could inherit their virtues together with their estates. And we need not look for further examples than that of Mr. Bacon, the son of a father whose excellencies were no less numerous: his merits had gained him the honour of being so much loved by Queen Elizabeth that she gave him the office of Keeper of the Seals and trusted to his hands the weightiest affairs of the Realm. Truth to say, I am sorry to confess that, shortly after his preferment to this eminent dignity, he became her chief instrument in establishing the Protestant Church in England.

Though the deed became odious in itself, in the light of practical politics, we shall readily judge it to be one of the most momentous and daring that have been undertaken in many centuries. So its author should not be esteemed less for it, so great was his dexterity in conducting the unfortunate affair: for in a very short time he altered the form and creed of a whole state without troubling its peace. Mr. Bacon was in duty bound to imitate the virtues not only of such a father but of *several other ancestors of his who have left so many marks of their greatness in History that honour and dignity seem to have been at all times the lot of his family.* And he could certainly not be reproached with adding less than his predecessors to the splendour of his race.

Since he was thus *born amid the purples*² and nourished in the hope

(1) "Etonné", then meaning thunder-struck, and not merely astonished.

(2) Thus, literally, though it is difficult to make a difference between "né parmi les pourpres" and the usual idiom "né dans la pourpre", *born in the purple.*

of a high destiny, his father had him instructed in the arts with such great and exacting care that I do not know to which of the two we are the more indebted for all the fine works he has left us—the mind of the son or the care exerted by the father in its training. Howbeit, our obligation to the father is not slight. In no man were ever judgment and memory so highly developed as they were in Mr. Bacon, so that within a very short time he became highly proficient in all the sciences that are taught in schools. And although he was even then considered capable of assuming the most important charges, nevertheless, in order not to fall into that error usually made by young men of his mettle, who, too hasty in their ambitions, often apply to great affairs a mind still replete with the raw teachings of the school, Mr. Bacon insisted upon acquiring that skill which in ancient times made Ulysses so commendable and won him the name of wise man through his knowledge of the customs of so many nations. *By this I mean that he spent some years of his youth in travel so as to polish his mind and shape his judgment through intercourse with all kinds of foreigners. France, Italy and Spain, being the most civilized countries of the world, were the countries to which his thirst for knowledge carried him. And as he saw himself destined to hold one day in his hands the helm of the Kingdom, instead of observing only the scenery and the various styles of clothing, as is the wont of most travellers, he already heeded the laws and customs of the countries he visited, noticing the various forms of government, the advantages and drawbacks of each state and all the other things that can make a man capable of governing peoples.*

Having thus reached the acme of doctrine and virtue, it was but fair that he should reach that of preferment. To this effect, though some time after his return home, the king, who was perfectly aware of his merit, gave him a few robes or offices that might serve him as stepping-stones to the major charges. Of those he acquitted himself so worthily that later he was thought fit to manage the very affairs that his father had relinquished with his last breath. In the discharge of that office of Chancellor, he gave so many testimonials of the greatness of his mind that it may be said without flattery that England owes to his judicious counsel and his straight comportment much of the peace she enjoyed so long. And it is not right that King James, who was then reigning, should ascribe the merit of this to himself alone, for undoubtedly Mr. Bacon must share it with him. This monarch, who may be truly said to have been one of the great Princes of his time, and who was a good judge of the value and merit of men, made very good use of him and relied upon his watchfulness to relieve himself of much of the burden of the crown. Nothing was proposed by the Chancellor for the good of the State or the maintenance of Justice that was not enforced by the power of the sovereign: the authority of the master furthered the good intentions of the servant, so that it must be owned that the Prince was worthy of having such a minister and he of serving so great a king.

Among so many virtues that made this exalted personage so worthy of esteem, prudence, the first of all moral virtues and the most ne-

essary to those in his profession, was that which shone in him most brightly. The depth of his knowledge appears clearly enough in his books and his matchless loyalty in the distinguished service he gave each day to his Prince. Never did man show a greater love of equity or devote himself to the public good with so much eagerness. Which enables me to say that he would have been a much more suitable man in a popular State than under a Monarch, for there the convenience of the Prince is often more contemplated than that of his people. Nor do I doubt that, had he lived in a Republic, he had acquired as much fame with the citizens as was the case of Aristides and Cato, the former in Athens and the latter in Rome. *Under his protection, oppressed innocence ever found a safe refuge and, with our Chancellor, the great did not derive any advantage from their rank in matters of justice.*

To vain glory, greed and ambition, vices which so often accompany great dignities, he was completely foreign, and his good deeds did not proceed from a yearning for glory but only from his inability to do otherwise. His good qualities were pure and unsullied by any admixture of imperfection; the very passions which usually constitute the defects of great men were to him but a source of virtue. If he experienced hatred and anger, it was only against the wicked in abhorrence of their crimes; and the good or ill success of his country's affairs were the staple of his joys and sorrows. He was an upright man as much as he was a just judge, and corrected vice and evil ways by the example of his conduct more than by sentences and punishments. In a word, it seemed that nature had left free of the common imperfections of men the very man she had ordained to chastise their crimes.

Because of these good qualities, he was adored by the people and cherished by those of the highest rank. But just when it seemed that nothing could ruin his well-established position, Fortune showed that she was still unwilling to change her fickle disposition and that Mr. Bacon was too deserving to enjoy her blessings so long. So it befell that, among the numerous staff that a man of such rank must needs keep, there was one who was indicted in Parliament on a charge of peculation and exploiting for money the trust his master reposed in him¹. And although the probity of Mr. Bacon was in no way questioned he was none the less blamed for his servant's crime and was in consequence deprived of the office he had held so long and with so much honour and fame. In this I must note the effects of great ingratitude and unparalleled brutality, when I realise that a man who could reckon the years and months of his life by the eminent services he had rendered to the State should be so harshly punished for a fault he had not committed. And through this deed England makes us realize that the sea which surrounds her imparts to her inhabitants something of its fickleness and inconstancy. The storm did not overwhelm him in the least and he received the news of his downfall⁽²⁾ with such composure

(1) Probably John Churchill, the "sub'orned informer" of the Sonnets.

(2) The French word *disgrace* can only mean disfavour, or downfall and is never a synonym for shame or guilt.

of countenance that it was clear that he cared little for the blessings of Fortune, since their loss caused him so little affliction.

Not far from London he had a country mansion adorned with whatever can bring relief to a mind galled by the anxieties of state and harrassed by the tumult of high society: there he retired to apply himself more freely to the reading of books and to spend in peace the rest of his life. But as he seemed to be born for the good of all mankind rather than for himself, and without State employment he could no longer benefit the public with his good deeds, he wished at least to make himself useful through his writings and through those books of his, worthy of admittance indeed to all the libraries of the world, and deserving to rank with the finest works of Antiquity.

The History of Henry VII is one of those for which we have his downfall to thank: a book so well received the world over that the greatest wish of all was to see it followed by the histories of the other kings. And he would not have disappointed this wish if Death had not forestalled him, depriving us of an achievement which would have outshone all the others.

The Natural History is another fruit of his retirement. The commendable desire to remain ignorant of nothing and to know the nature and qualities of all things, induced him to make experiments, which some curious minds might have conceived, but which nobody could conduct so well as he. There indeed he met with such success that few things escaped his notice. He availed himself of every occasion to expose the falsehoods of the old philosophy and indicated all the errors that have crept into learning on the authority of the first exponents of that science. But whilst he was engrossed in that fine work, his penury obliged him to call back his mind to domestic cares; *the great probity that had ruled his life was the only cause of his poverty, for since he was more anxious to acquire honour than to hoard worldly riches, he had always given preference to the interests of the state over those of his household. While in great favour he had neglected the opportunities of enriching himself; so, after spending a few years in retirement, he found himself in such pressing need that he was compelled to appeal to the king, calling upon his liberality to obtain some relief from his destitution.*

I do not know if poverty is the begetter of fine things, but it must be owned that the letter he sent on the subject is one of the most excellent pieces of writing that were ever produced of its kind. The request he sent to that Prince for a pension is conceived in such dignified terms and with such good grace that it could not be declined, it seems, without grave injustice. Having thus obtained what he needed to be saved from his predicament, he went back to his work, probing again into the most important secrets of nature. And while he was attempting, during a period of hard frost, to discover some particular effects of the cold, having stayed too long in the open, unmindful that his age made him unable to bear such exposure, the cold, working more easily on a body to which age had already given its own qualities, drove away without effort whatever remained in him

of natural heat and reduced him to that extremity which the great reach only too soon.

Nature failed him at the very time he was praising her, probably because she is a miser and hides from us her best riches. She feared lest he might discover all her treasures at last, and make all men learned at her expense. Such was the end of that great personage whom England truly can put on a par with the most excellent men of all times.

Notice to our American Members



Please note the exceptional offer of
MANES VERULAMIANI advertised on
page 74 at \$3 (21/- sterling nett). This
beautifully produced book should be in
every Baconian bibliophile's library.

A PIONEER: IV

By M.P.

"The Statesman's Notebook"

THE political undercurrent of the Shakespeare Plays is seldom penetrated. With the exception of Delia Bacon, whose chapters "The Statesman's Notebook" and "The Popular Election" well repay study, few commentators seem to be concerned with the real purpose behind many of the plays, other than entertainment.

In 1817 Hazlitt hovered near the truth

"*Coriolanus* is a storehouse of political commonplaces. Anyone who studies it may save himself the trouble of reading Burke's reflections or Pain's rights of Man, or the debates in both houses of Parliament since the French Revolution and our own."

But Hazlitt offers no suggestion as to how the Stratford actor could have gained this experience, though this was to be the question which led a great statesman, Bismarck, to reject the orthodox tradition of authorship.

The authenticated facts of the actor's life throw no light whatever on this problem. The story of his life as we have it, obliges his admirers to admit that he wrote for "business" reasons, and that his art was sublimely unconscious, a simple out-pouring of genius, "the native warbling of woodnotes wild". Any services to Civilisation or to the evolution of the human mind are therefore regarded as incidental rather than deliberate. Thus, at a recent international gathering at Stratford, the "political thinking" in the plays is naively attributed to "the early influence of Stratford-on-Avon", while the "human" content of the Roman plays is referred to the actor's "private experience of organic life in a small community". One can almost hear the contemptuous grunt of Bismarck at this view of the Statesman's Notebook!

Commentators of a more aesthetic turn of mind are sometimes repelled by the idea of "intentions" in Art; although one intention certainly does emerge from Shakespeare's biography and is quite inescapable. If he wrote the plays at all, he wrote them for gain, and when he had made enough he started business as a small trader. Returning to his native village he seems to have occupied himself for a good many years in "cornering" malt and in suing impoverished neighbours for small sums "lent," like the good business man he was!

To Delia Bacon (as to others, among whom are numbered Lord Palmerston, Disraeli, Cardinal Newman, Walt Whitman, John Bright, A. P. Sinnett, Emerson and Bismarck) all this did not "add up". It was impossible to marry these unfortunate facts to the supposed authorship of some thirty-six plays clearly exhibiting the qualities of

statesman, lawyer, philosopher and poet. On the contrary, the facts rather suggest that the actor's consent to a certain subterfuge was bought for cash, and that he probably drove a hard bargain. Greene's "upstart crow"¹ plainly suggests that he profited by the work of others, and was probably a play-broker. It is also credibly reported that he "was indeed honest". But none of these qualities account for the ripeness of political experience exhibited in the plays, quite apart from the poetry and philosophy, and so a host of conjectures as to his "probable" education have been included in his biography without supporting evidence of any kind.

Every student of Shakespeare is sooner or later confronted with these anomalies and must make his choice. Accepting the unwelcome life story of the actor because he must, he can either accept or reject him as author of the plays. Delia Bacon felt compelled to reject him, and to look among his contemporaries for this elusive master-mind. It was the political sagacity expressed in the plays which, more than anything else, lead her to adopt Lord Bacon as the principal author. She found *Coriolanus* to be a deliberate and pre-meditated lesson in politics and sociology, crowded from first to last "with a political learning which has no match in letters, or the world would be in better case than it is". She found in it the "new philosophic statesman's ripest lore, the patient fruits of observation strange".

When a popular idol or a vested interest is called in question, there are bound to be differences of opinion. The same differences existed among the men of letters with whom Delia Bacon originally discussed her theory. The kindly and personally sympathetic Carlyle was quite unable to relinquish his "Idol of the Theatre" and continued to indulge in hero-worship of the most extreme kind. Emerson, on the other hand, faced the facts coolly, and his dictum—that of a very profound thinker—is not far from that of Bismarck "An obscure and profane life I cannot marry this fact to his verse". This is the candour of the true critic, but when will such candour prevail?

There are signs that this may happen before long. At the recent gathering at Stratford, Mr. H. J. Oliver of Sidney, in a most interesting paper, described the real theme of *Coriolanus* as "the proper place in a democratic or would-be democratic society of the pure aristocrat who, rightly or wrongly, will never compromise"—a theme which, as he points out, required a considerable deviation from Plutarch. This is a very searching criticism because it implies a deliberate alteration to a classical story *to meet the needs of a new dramatic purpose*. It comes close to Delia Bacon's interpretation of a century ago, but takes no account of the strong compelling motive necessary to force such a theme on to the stage or into print in those despotic days.

As it happens *Coriolanus* was neither printed nor acted until the actor had been dead seven years. Whoever wrote it had become so steeped in the theory of the blood-circulation (*cf.*the Harvey

(¹) "Groatsworth of Wit".

Lectures 1616/8) as to be able to write it into the speech of Menenius Agrippa in Act 1. in illustration of a political theory.

".....Note me this, good friend;
Your most grave belly was deliberate,
Not rash like his accusers, and thus answered;
'True it is, my incorporate friends' quoth he,
'That I receive the general food at first
Which you do live upon; and fit it is,
Because I am the store-house and the shop
of the whole body: but, if you do remember,
I send it through the rivers of your blood,
Even to the court, the heart, to the seat o' the brain;
And, through the cranks and offices of man,
The strongest nerves and small inferior veins
From me receive that natural competency
Whereby they live.....'"

This speech, and the context which so carefully frames it, is quite a curiosity of literature. It usually arouses the interest of medical men, whatever their private views as to the authorship. But if Bacon wrote the play, not only would he have made it such a repository of political wisdom, garnered in half a life-time in the House of Commons (thus satisfying Hazlitt's criticism), but his friendship with Harvey as Court Physician would have placed him in the best position to illustrate his political and social thinking in this technical and picturesque way.

Let it not be thought that by stressing these underlying intentions of the author we seek in any way to disparage the excellent work of modern critics. The Prefaces of Granville-Barker and the interpretations of Colin Still, Wilson Knight, and Mark van Doren, do much to deepen our interest in Shakespeare. On *Coriolanus* both latter critics draw attention to the "political thinking", but without attempting any explanation of the authorship, which is discreetly left in the air. The candour, the quixotry, and perhaps even the courage of Delia Bacon are lacking. Nevertheless these are criticisms of a high order, and indirectly they support her theory. Thus Mark van Doren:—

"The political 'meaning' of the play is considerably less simple than it may seem. If it has to do with the difference between the many and the one, that difference is viewed from both directions. The many, the Roman mob, are criticised without mercy, but so is Coriolanus as the one. The Tribunes of the people are convicted of his pride, and there is something in Volumnia's charge that it is they, rather than he, by whom the rabble become incensed. Certainly they are represented as dishonest demagogues, and their complete wrongness with respect to the possibility of an attack from Aufidius renders them as statesmen contemptible. The mob, as usual in Shakespeare, behaves badly, and even permits one of its members to castigate its many-headedness."

"..... Aufidius presents the summary but the fact that it is not especially characteristic of the speaker, reminds us that Shakespeare has been writing the kind of play which needs such

anomalies. The kind of play which calls on its characters to say what it means—to do in other words the author's work—may be admirable, as *Coriolanus* is, but it cannot be attractive”.

It is hard to believe that, in writing these words, Mark van Doren had not detected in this play a political instrument of the kind discerned by Delia Bacon. A shorter passage from Granville-Barker's interesting Preface to “Julius Cæsar” confirms the view that something is still left unexplained

“But Shakespeare will never be too sure that he understands these Romans. He does not instinctively know their minds as he knew Henry's or Hotspur's or Falstaff's. He is even capable of transcribing a fine-sounding passage from Plutarch and making something very like nonsense out of it Casca, raw from Plutarch, has mettle enough to ride off with a scene or two. Decius Brutus, Ligarius, Lucilius are lifted whole from his pages But Brutus, Cassius and Anthony, though he found them alive, he must set out to re-create on his own terms Collaborating with Plutarch he can be critic and creator too”

The critic here discreetly begs the question. To say that Shakespeare understood the English mind better than the Roman mind is very probably true, but it is beside the point. The real point is that some of his Romans are lifted whole from the pages of Plutarch while others (usually the most important ones) are deftly manipulated so as to embody the underlying purpose of the play.

Wilson Knight concentrates more on the artistic construction of the plays. The great charm of his essays is in their vivid reminders of the different forms of imagery employed for different effects, moral, political, or erotic. On *Coriolanus* he writes as follows:—

“Notice the metallic suggestion; the ‘city gate’, the ‘din’ which pierces ‘sense’ and a fine hyperbole of Coriolanus ‘striking’ the whole town with planetary impact This is our grim protagonist. So he charges through the action like a steel-headed spear”.

“Nature-images point us to the same thought. They both contrast with our metallic images, preparing us for the love-victory later, and point the natural excellence of our hero Thus there is a continual contrast between the strong and weak things in nature directly or indirectly related to the Coriolanus-Plebeian opposition”.

“The play does not emphasise directly the conflict of parties, but rather *the birth of conflicting individual prides dragging parties asunder*”.

The last sentence, which I have italicised, is a wonderful commentary not only on this play, but on the international and industrial problems of to-day. What greater barrier than that of “conflicting prides” comes between employers and unions? Only when this egocentric emotion is raised to *the table of inquiry* of the mind and successfully counter-balanced by a more altruistic emotion, will there be any lasting peace.

Much of Delia Bacon's work consists in indicating how social and political problems were raised and discussed in the Shakespeare Plays without becoming a subject of official inquiry. It was "contact" work of a most ingenious kind. For however revolutionary the ideas expressed, it was hard to institute proceedings against an elusive playwright whose reading of Roman history was so profound that he could draw these ideas so glibly from the lips of his *dramatis personae*. And if, as Delia Bacon suggests, these profound speculations came from a master-mind controlling a group of "good pens", it was all the more difficult to lay the author by the heels.

A charming story recorded by Bacon himself leads us to suppose that Queen Elizabeth may have recognised this when she fenced with him over the authorship of *Richard II*, to which she most strongly objected. The story leaves us in the dark as to what finally happened; though if her Majesty saw through the "Tacitus" mystification,¹ she apparently took no action against Bacon, who was probably too useful, nor apparently against his mask. But Hayward, who wrote the prose version of *Richard II*, was imprisoned in the Tower for many years, and henceforward the Plays were no longer anonymous, except in a few re-prints.

The name "Shakespere", which had been used four years earlier as signing the dedications of the two classical poems,² re-appeared in 1598 on the title-pages of the second editions of *Richard II* and *Richard III*, as "William Shake-speare", and also on the first edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* as "W. Shakespere". The latter play, with its clear reference to the court of Navarre, must have left the Queen in no doubt as to the author, for had she not sent the young Francis Bacon into that glittering company at an age when he was in revolt against the philosophy of Aristotle? In *Love's Labour's Lost* pedantry is satirized and philosophy humanized by the delights of living and loving. In Mark van Doren's words, it is Shakespeare's most artificial play, but it ends with his most natural song.³

From this point of view, the plays really do provide that "Table of Inquiry" which Bacon assigns to the fourth part of his *Instauration* and which is generally supposed to be missing:

"I form Tables of *invention* for Anger,
Fear, and Shame, as well as examples
in civil affairs"

(*Novum Organum*)

But it is from the Roman plays of *Julius Cæsar* and *Coriolanus*, and from *King Lear*, that Delia Bacon draws most of the "instances" which support her theory. *Coriolanus* as an example of Bacon's "Predominant Instances" seems to be a remarkable good shot. In this play she sees represented the inevitable collision between Civil Interests (as we understand them to-day) and "those more personal interests which the heroic ages had enthroned"; the collision between that kind of government which the unlearned masses will always re-create, if power is

(1) See Bacon's *Apophthegms*, No. 58 (22).

(2) *Venus and Adonis* 1593 and *Tarquin and Lucrece* 1594.

(3) "When daisies pied and violets blue..."

placed in their hands, and the kind of government which enlightened man "in a better hour" will always demand.

We can see the continuation of this struggle in its later stages to-day. The struggle between real democracy and totalitarianism, between democratic law and dictatorship, whether by one man or a "union." For, as the author of *Coriolanus* so clearly foresaw, it is the popular election which can so easily become the "Monster of the multitude",¹ usurping the seat of the ancient tyrant.

All great Unions and Federations in the world to-day are learning the lesson of *Coriolanus*. Despotism, disguised as the many-headed monster of the masses, can show itself to be more tyrannical, more cruel and unforgiving, than the ancient military chieftain. The free expression of individual thought ought never to be inhibited. We owe this to our Elizabethan forebears who, scorning the block, the stake, and the gallows (as Delia so constantly reminds us), contrived to raise so many questions to the "Table of Inquiry". The Police State, pursued to its logical conclusion, becomes the ant-hill; a magnificent piece of organisation no doubt, but one in which evolution must slow down and cease, because the evolutionary principle itself has been sacrificed. This is the blind alley which eternally threatens civilisation. The automatism of all self-perpetuating forms of government spreads like a cancer; and sharp surgery is sometimes necessary. The dictator and the union must alike be prepared to go, cap-in-hand, like Coriolanus to the market, cost what it may to their pride. Only thus can the "popular election" become purged and re-dedicated.

It is strange that this element of prophecy in the Plays has not attracted greater notice

"Not mine own fears, nor the prophetic soul
Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come".

To Delia Bacon it seemed obvious that the author of the Folio had looked into the future of the race and had seen how much violence could be avoided if men could be brought to "weigh and consider". As the Poet of the New Age, he had tried to draw up the *Agenda* for the New Age in a series of unique stage plays. Through his method of "lively representation," he hoped people would learn something of the nature of desires and emotions, controlled or uncontrolled by the mind

"Therefore brave conquerors for so you are
That war against your own affections
And the huge army of the world's desires".

(*Love's Labour's Lost*)

If the words of this poet had been truly heeded this lesson might have been more harmlessly and bloodlessly learnt by the method of "literate experience,"² inside the framework of an imagined dramatic universe, instead of so painfully on the field of battle.

In the play of *Coriolanus* the whole question of dictatorship is

(¹) *Coriolanus* II, 3.

(²) cf. Bacon's "Experientia Literata."

scientifically treated, be it the dictatorship of the warrior or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the guise of an historical impersonation, "under the mask of an old Roman hero," it is really the heroic forms of our own Elizabethan age which steal upon the stage. In Delia Bacon's charming phrase, "The Theatre is indeed the Globe"—even the great globe itself—while these dim foreshadowings of a more enlightened rule are beginning to take shape.

"..... so our virtues
Lie in the interpretation of the times".

It was only under the cover of that "old rusty Roman helmet" that these revolutionary thoughts could be uttered. It was not simply the distinction between aristocracy and democracy, it concerned a far more radical distinction, the difference between "the Civil magistracy which represented the Roman people", and that "unconstitutional popular power which the popular tyranny will always re-create", once the power is in its hands. This is the substance of Delia Bacon's most searching criticism, and it vitally concerns the industrial and national troubles of to-day. In her own words,

"No plea at the bar was ever more finely and eloquently laboured
..... It was at the bar of *Foreign Nations and the Next Ages*
that this defence was prepared. And the speaker who speaks
so *pressly* is the lawyer, so there is nothing left unsaid at last".

So does Delia find her way to the author, to the speaker who speaks so "pressly",—as Ben Jonson wrote of Francis Bacon. The play of *Coriolanus* shows the aristocrat in every line. But it is an aristocrat who had served a life apprenticeship in the Commons; one who, while holding the commonweal at heart, could still express the nobler and finer feelings of a prince. For here, on the stage, is the struggle of pride and selfish ambition arranged against the common weal; but here also (as Delia points out) is the aristocrat who contends for the common weal, against "the narrowness and short-sightedness of the multitude".

To Delia the Spirit of English Renaissance expresses itself through two pens, outwardly labelled Bacon and Shakespeare. But when both are studied together the identity of purpose makes it impossible to believe that these two pens were unacquainted with one another, that the right hand did not know what the left was doing.

Even Gervinus stresses this complete identity

"Scarcely can anything be said of Shakespeare's position generally with regard to mediæval poetry which does not bear upon the position of the Renovator Bacon with regard to mediæval philosophy. Neither knew nor mentioned the other, although Bacon was almost called upon to have done so in his remarks upon the theatre of his day"

"..... For just as Shakespeare was an interpreter of the secrets of history and human nature, Bacon was an interpreter of lifeless nature. Just as Shakespeare went from instance to instance in his judgement of moral actions, and never founded a law on single experience, so did Bacon in Natural Science"

Although modern Shakespearian criticism is making advances, it is not yet attempting to come closer to the author. Rather is it postponing that inevitable recognition. The gold in the plays is becoming understood as never before—as it was never understood by more than a handful of the author's contemporaries. But the mine from which that gold is quarried only reveals itself to the true Pioneer, to such a one as Delia. True, Lord Bacon himself drew attention to this altruistic use of "dramatic poesy", but few read him and still fewer understand him. It is on record that King James, on reading his copy of the Great Instauration, found it so unintelligible that he could jokingly exclaim with more truth than he knew, "It is like the Peace of God, it passeth understanding".

(to be concluded)

Price Reduction

MANES VERULAMIANI will be offered at 21/- (sterling nett) only while surplus copies are being cleared. Postage 6d. extra.

Individually numbered copies are included.

SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS AND "MR. W. H."

by

R. J. A. BUNNETT, F.S.A.

"There are some of us to whom it is quite sufficient to dispel doubts, to dissipate false teaching, and to exorcise some of the delusions by which the human mind is possessed, even although human happiness is not thereby appreciably increased."

Sir George Greenwood

"This bookseller's collection remains for more than one cause an ambiguous volume."

Isaac Disraeli

The Amenities of Literature.

In the Elizabethan age the fashion for sonneteering was sudden and short-lived, and had been stimulated by the publication of Sidney's "Astrophel and Stella" in 1591. By 1598 it had practically died out.

In Shakespeare's Sonnets "a perturbed spirit" wrote Sir Edmund Chambers¹ "is behind the quiet mask." "Here is a record of misplaced and thwarted affections, of imperfections and disabilities" Professor Saintsbury² remarked. "There is nothing mysterious about the Sonnets, except the mystery of their poetical beauty. Some of them are evidently addressed in the rather hyperbolical language of affection, common at the time, and derived from the study of Greek and Italian writers, to a man; others in language not hyperbolical at all, to a woman. Disdain, rivalry, suspense, short-lived joy, long sorrow, all the symptoms and concomitants of the passion of love. . . . form their motives." Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke (³) said of the Sonnets, "So warm with very heart-blood are they, so glowing and impassioned are their every sentence, that we can never read them without being moved to our own heart's core; yet there is in them not a syllable that declares the personality of either their object or their author."

Some consider that they are undoubtedly the work of Bacon's youthful days, exercises of his 'pupil pen' and intended only for his private friends. Numerous parallelisms are to be found between a number of the Sonnets and the early plays, all written before 1598. Young Francis when at Gray's Inn, and engaged in arranging plays and masques and interludes was a very different person from the thoughtful philosopher of Gorhambury, musing on Man's lot over the Elements of Nature. He was then the bosom friend of notorious libertines. Bacon, said Alfred Dodd, had designedly disarranged the

¹"William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems."

²"Elizabethan Literature".

³"The Shakespeare Key" 1879.

sonnets, and so Dodd rearranged them into what he believed to be the original order, dividing them into Cantos and finding therein—"An anxious youth begging his mother, the Queen of England, to acknowledge him as heir to the House of Tudor." He craves the Queen to love him as a mother should love a child since she cannot publicly acknowledge him in the Succession. He touches on the story and tragedy of Essex. He tells of his hopes and his fears regarding his sweetheart, Margaret of Navarre. He speaks of his wife. He shows you his literary ideals—Apollo, the God of Poetry, Pallas Athene, the Spear-Shaker; his Brain-Child, the wonderful Shake-speare Folio, his lovely boy by Pallas, and like a proud father you see him fingering the volume with the love of an author for his child.

He talks of his secondary personality, Shake-speare. He plays cunningly with the subtle conception of a lyrical self-communion, which apostrophizes in turn Pallas the Goddess, Shake-speare as his dramatic Second-Self, and himself as Francis Bacon, the lyrical poet. The dramatization is so finely executed that everyone has believed that these imaginary personalities had a real existence. . . . a lovely youth, a dark lady, a rival poet spun from airy nothings. He tells the story of his Fall and how it came about. He finishes by whispering to the Brethren of the Masonic Craft the most beautiful valediction in the English language.

He seals his work with a private mark. . . . He leaves his name by cipher all over the Sonnets. He writes his name and his titles by enfolding writing over and over again.

This is unquestionably a great imaginative effort on the part of the author, and will repay a close study by anyone interested, especially Freemasons.

* * * *

And yet over the Sonnets hang a number of still unsolved theories, which continue to excite enquiry, and the identity of 'Mr. W. H.', the 'Onlie Begetter', has for long exercised the minds of scholars and others. Many and varied are the views expressed; but the clouds can hardly yet be claimed to have been indubitably dispersed. Of course so many investigators handicap themselves at the outset by working on the outmoded idea that the man from Stratford was the author of the Sonnets.

* * * *

In 1598 Francis Meres,¹ in his "Palladis Tamia" stated:—"As the soul of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras, so the sweet, witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous, honey-tongued Shakespeare. Witness his 'Venus and Adonis', his 'Lucrece', his sugard² sonnets among his friends."

¹*Francis Meres*. (1565-1647). Miscellaneous author, and rector of Wing-in-Rutland. His "Palladis Tamia" i.e. "Wit's Treasury" contains a comparison of English poets with the Greek, Latin and Italian.

²'Sugard'. This epithet refers to verses written with coloured ink to which sugar was added: when dry, the writing shone brightly.

There is no evidence that these were the complete 154 sonnets of the 1609 Quarto; but however many, they were doubtless in circulation in MS., it being the custom of a young poet to distribute among the circle of his friends copies of a poem or song, as soon as written. Next year two of them,

No. 138 beginning:—

"When my love swears that she is made of truth,
I do believe her, though I know she lies. . ."

and No. 144 beginning:—

"Two loves I have of comfort and despair,
Which like two spirits do suggest me still. . ."

were printed for the first time by a piratical publisher, William Jaggard, in the opening pages of "The Passionate Pilgrim."

* * * *

In those days the holder of a MS. copy of any literary composition was entitled to reproduce it, or publish it as he pleased, without any reference to the author. John Middleton Murry¹ considers that the publication of the Sonnets could only have happened by the connivance or carelessness of the person to whom they were addressed. It would seem, this writer says, to Shakespeare, to be "an act of perfidy committed with the purpose of dragging his name and reputation into the mud." The friendship had long since decayed, but the handing over of the sonnets to the printer was "a contemptuous indecency." So Shakespeare placed in the forefront of that bitter, incoherent play, "Timon of Athens", "a poet in the act of presenting his work to a truly noble lord, suddenly, almost involuntarily, remembering a former act of dedication, feeling that by its baseness his present sincerity is corrupted:—

When we for recompense have praised the vile
It strains the glory of that happy verse
Which aptly sings the good. . ."

* * * *

Thomas Thorpe, who in 1594 had taken up the Freedom of the Stationers' Company, signed in 1600 the Dedication of Christopher Marlowe's translation, which he had made at Cambridge, of the "First Book of Lucan's² 'Pharsalia', to his friend Edward Blount, then like himself a stationer's assistant! Blount had already achieved a modest success as a procurer or picker-up of neglected copy, for in 1598 he had become the proprietor of Marlowe's unfinished and unpublished 'Hero and Leander', which volume was dedicated to Marlowe's old friend and patron, the Right Worshipfull, Sir Thomas Walsingham, Knight. Thorpe's dedication opens with the words "Blunt I purpose to be blunt with you" and he reminds him that, "this spirit (i.e. Marlowe) whose ghost or genius is to be seen walk the Churchyard

¹'Shakespeare', 1935.

²Lucan. Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (39-65 A.D.) was the chief Roman poet of the 'silver age'. He joined Piso's conspiracy against Nero (65 A.D.) for which he suffered death. The 'Pharsalia' which is unfinished tells the story of the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey, and is Lucan's sole surviving work.

(of St. Paul's) in at the least three or four sheets. . . was sometime a familiar of your own." The customarily selected noble, but niggardly patron, comes in for some uncomplimentary remarks. "One special virtue in our patrons of these days I have promised myself you shall fit excellently, which is to give nothing." Thorpe's reference to St. Paul's Churchyard, where the book went on sale, at 'the Signe of the Flower de Luce,' is followed by a pun on the sheets of the quarto. Marlowe is stated to have been killed in a tavern brawl in 1593. Through Blount's good offices, Peter Short undertook to print the 'Lucan', and Walter Burre to sell it at his shop in St. Paul's Churchyard. Blount's name also appears on the title-page of the First Folio, 1623, as one of the printers with Isaac Jaggard.

* * * *

Under the date of 20th May, 1609, "Shakespeare's Sonnettes" were entered in the Stationers' Register to Thomas Thorpe:— "Thomas Thorpe Entred for his copie under th(e) (h)andes of Master Wilson and Master Lownes Warden a Booke calld Shakespeare's sonnettes vjd." The book was shortly afterwards published in quarto, and priced at fivepence with the following title-page:—

" Shake-speare
Sonnets
Never before imprinted
at London
By G. Eld for T.T. and are to be solde by
William Aspley
1609 "

Another edition reads, "and are to be solde by John Wright, dwelling at Christ Church gate. 1609."

* * * *

Appended to the volume was a hitherto unpublished poem in Spenserean vein, entitled "A Lover's Complaint"; but whether written by the author of the Sonnets is undetermined.

* * * *

Sir Edmund Chambers said:— "The 1609 text is not a very good one. It may rest upon a fairly authoritative manuscript, but there are sufficient misprints, including misprints of punctuation not explicable upon any theory of rhetorical punctuation to make it clear the volume cannot have been 'overseen' as "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece" may have been, by Shakespeare. The absence of any author's epistle is a further indication of this.

Dr. G. H. Rendall¹ attributed the misprints to a compositor who, "though often careless, mechanical or illiterate, had no occasion to tamper with the text."

B. G. Theobald² was of opinion that these "apparent misprints and curious spellings may be purposely arranged for the requirements of some as yet undiscovered cipher system." It is to be observed that the *metrical* arrangement is remarkably free from error.

¹"Shake-speare Handwriting and Spelling." 1931.

²"Shakespeare's Sonnets Unmasked." 1929.

The title itself, "Shake-speare's Sonnets"—(the name is hyphenated as in many of the early Quartos of the Plays) instead of, as might be expected, the "Sonnets of William Shakespeare." shows what Sir Sidney Lee¹ characterizes as a "tradesman's collocation of words." Ben Jonson was probably aiming at this hyphen when in the 'Poet-aster' he speaks of 'Cri-spinus' or 'Cri-spinas.'

* * * *

Both Professor Dowden and Sir Sidney Lee state that in June 1609 the actor Edward Alleyn wrote in his Diary that he bought a copy of the Sonnets for fivepence; but this Diary was once held privately by the notorious Shakespearean forger, Collier, who, says the Dictionary of National Biography "dealt with Alleyn's² papers in 1843...nothing of Collier's can be trusted without reference to the actual documents."

* * * *

Alfred Dodd³ maintained that there was no publication of the sonnets in 1609, and that the book does not bear this date, but only a number 1609, and that there is no mention therein of any date of publication. The sonnets were in "sure wards of trust," said the poet. "How careful was I when I took my way into the world, each trifle, each Sonnet, under truest bars to thrust, that to my use my jewels of personal emotion might unused stay." It has been proved that four of the Plays bearing allegedly the dates 1600 and 1608, were, in fact, printed in 1619. If, as Dodd claims, the Sonnets contain distinct reference to public incidents which occurred in 1620/21, they could not have been published in 1609. An author, he declared, could enter the title of a book on the Stationers' Register, and write it at his convenience, which prevented anyone else from using such a title. Some titles were so entered, no books under such being produced; others not until a couple of years or so after the entry.

* * * *

It is a curious fact, as J. M. Robertson remarked, that the "failure of the Sonnets to reach a second edition calls for an explanation that has not yet been forthcoming." The Sonnets of Drayton⁴ and Daniel⁵ readily found a market. Dodd shows that none of the editors, and commentators, or biographers of Shakespeare from 1733, Lewis, Theobald, Dr. Warburton, Dr. Farmer, Edward Capell, Thomas

¹"A Life of William Shakespeare." 1899. Lee's "Life", as a reviewer said, was only "A Life"—but contains, it must be admitted, much useful detail.

²*Alleyn, Edward.* (1566-1626) As an actor, owner, and builder of theatres, and as bear-master to the king, he became very wealthy, and rose to a distinguished social position. In 1619 Alleyn founded Dulwich College.

³"When was 'Shake-speare's Sonnets' First Published?" 1937.

⁴*Drayton Michael.* (1563-1631) His collection of sonnets—a sequence of 63—was entitled "Idea's Mirrour", 'Idea' being the lady to whom they were addressed. (1619) Among other good things it contains the noted, "Since there's no help, come, let us kiss and part."

⁵*Daniel, Samuel.* (1562-1619) His works include sonnets, epistles (generally considered his best efforts) masques and dramas. The most important of Daniel's writings was "The History of the Civil Wars between York and Lancaster" in eight books (1604).

Tyrwhitt, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Messrs. Bell, Etherington, Masson Reed, Colman or Richardson so much as refer to the 1609 Quarto, and many of them do not mention the Sonnets at all.

* * * *

It was not until 1766 that George Steevens (1736-1800) reprinted twenty old Quarto copies of the Plays in four volumes. He assisted Dr. Johnson—who described Steevens as a mischievous fellow—in his edition of 'Shakespeare' and also in the Doctor's 'Lives of the Poets.' In 1793 Steevens brought out a new edition of Shakespeare, in which he dealt somewhat freely with the text. In the 'Advertisement' to the "Twenty Old Quarto Reprints", he wrote:—

I have likewise reprinted 'Shakespeare's Sonnets' from a copy published in 1609 by G. Eld, one of the printers of his Plays, which added to the consideration that they made their appearance in his lifetime, seems to be no slender proof of their authenticity."

This, declared Dodd, is the first mention of the 1609 Quarto in English literature, and he maintained that Steevens was a member of 'Francis Bacon's Secret Society' and had been put up to bring the 1609 Quarto to the notice of the literary world.

* * * *

Fourteen years later, Edward Malone (1741-1812)—the friend of Johnson, Goldsmith, Reynolds and Burke—who aided in the direction of the Rowley forgeries of Chatterton, and those of Ireland, published the Quarto sonnets, altering the text to suit his own ideas.

The critics and editors still ignored the 1609 Quarto, and continued to print the "1640 Medley." In this year J. Benson published a medley of the "Passionate Pilgrim" type, but on a more extensive scale, entitled, "Poems: Written by Will Shakespeare, Gent." It contains the greater number of the Sonnets, but omits eight (18, 19, 43, 56, 75, 76, 96, and 126 of the quarto edition). The sonnets are here regrouped under fancy headings, and the pronouns altered so as to suggest that those really written to a man were written to a woman. "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece" are not included in the volume, but "A Lover's Complaint" is given, and many poems from the "Passionate Pilgrim" are interspersed among the Sonnets. In the short preface to the book, Benson tells us that Shakespeare during his lifetime had "avouched the purity" of the Sonnets, and implies secondly that they failed to attract many readers.¹

In 1790 Malone bitterly complained, "It is extraordinary that none of Shakespeare's various Editors have ever taken the trouble to compare them (the Sonnets) with the earliest and most authentic copies."

Three years later Steevens in his edition of Shakespeare's works wrote:— "We have not reprinted the Sonnets... the strongest act of Parliament that could be framed would fail to compel readers into their

¹Samuel Butler in his "Shakespeare's Sonnets Reconsidered" 1927 edition, deals exhaustively with Benson's Medley. Pp. 3-8.

service. . . Their only intelligent editor Mr. Malone is disgraced by the objects of their culture. . . If Shakespeare had produced no other works than these, his name would have reached us with as little celebrity than Watson¹ a more elegant Sonneteer."

This had the effect of drawing Malone into a defence of the Sonnets, though he deprecated the morals of the Author, who he declared, stood a self-confessed libertine, having abandoned his wife for the embraces of a wanton. And so the question of the moral aspect of the Sonnets had been openly mooted, and the controversy as to their meaning had begun.

* * *

In 1797 George Chalmers² brought the problem of the Sonnets definitely before the literary world. This is still being thrashed out today. "Who was Mr. W. H.?" Who was T.T., etc.

* * *

Incidentally Dodd³ also states that a strictly limited edition of the Sonnets was published in 1625, but not issued to the world at large, but to the 'Rosicrosse and Masonic Brotherhoods'.

* * *

But assuming, as is generally accepted, that the Sonnets were actually published in 1609, we have the famous Dedication:

To. The Onlie. Begetter. Of.

These. Insuing. Sonnets.

Mr. W. H. All. Happinesse.

And. That. Eternitie.

Promised.

By.

Our. Ever-Living. Poet.

Wisheth.

The. Well-Wishing.

Adventure. In.

Setting.

Forth.

T.T.

It has been stated that the full stops after each word indicate that these are complete in themselves, and must not be regarded as linking up with the next word, and that thereby the reader is warned that the words must be rearranged to get their correct meaning.

The wording of this Dedication is obviously fantastic, and we should expect it to run thus: "The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth (i.e. the publisher) T(homas) T(horpe) wisheth Mr. W. H., the only begetter of these ensuing sonnets, all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living poet." Alfred Dodd transposes

¹Thomas Watson (1557? - 1592). A translator, who in 1582 published "Hecatompathia" or "The Passionate Centurie of Love," 100 18-line poems, which he called sonnets, followed by other works.

²George Chalmers (1742-1825). Antiquary and author. His chief work was his 'Caledonia' - which was to have been a complete collection of the topography and antiquities of Scotland, of which 3 volumes had been published at his death.

³"The Secret History of Francis Bacon." 1931.

the wording thus:—"the only begetter of Mr. William Himself wished all happiness to the adventurer in setting forth these insuing sonnets; and that eternity promised by our well-wishing ever-living poet.

Fra. Bacon."

There is nothing unusual in the employment of initials in the dedication—printers and publishers, authors, and contributors of prefatory commendations were all habitually masking themselves behind such symbols, in Elizabethan and Jacobean books. Dedications generally consisted of two distinct parts, a dedicatory epistle touching on the subject of the book, and the writer's relations with the patron. In addition there was for the most part a preliminary salutation confined to a single sentence. The assumption that in his retirement at Stratford, William Shakspeare threw the sonnets upon the world without note, comment or remark, or that he submitted without protest to an unauthorised publication, is too absurd to be tenable. Thorpe described the author of the sonnets as our 'ever-living poet.' This would seem to imply that he was accordingly dead, and it would not be easy to discover or even imagine a motive for publication in the author's lifetime, if he was cognizant of the fact. The sonnets would hardly enhance his reputation, and they contained much matter to compromise and give a handle to critics and enemies.

* * * *

All probable claimants to authorship were living in 1609, except Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford¹.

* * * *

'Shakespeare' uses the epithet 'ever-living' once only:—

"The ever-living man of memory

Henry the Fifth."

I. Henry VI.

It was employed by several poets and prose writers including Shelley, Wordsworth and Tennyson.

* * * *

Hazlitt gives great credit to Thorpe for bestowing such a distinction as 'ever-living' on Shakespeare, and affirms that the singular preface to the 1609 Quarto to "*Troilus and Cressida*" was also Thorpe's work.

Perhaps the latter was having a sly hit at the immense importance the poet had given to his eternal lines:

So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,

So long lives this, and this gives life to thee."

XVIII.

* * * *

A George Eld was employed to print the MS., and two book-sellers William Aspley and John Wright to distribute it to the public. Eld for many years co-operated with Thorpe in business, and in 1605 printed for him Ben Jonson's '*Sejanus*.' Eld's name figures more prominently upon Thorpe's books than that of any other printer.

¹J. Thomas Looney in his "*Shakespeare Identified*" (1920) very ably argues the case for the Oxford authorship.

Thomas Thorpe was a native of Barnet, where his father was an innkeeper. In 1584 he was apprenticed for nine years to a reputable printer and stationer, Richard Watkins, but though Thorpe had thirty years experience of the book trade he only appears to have held his own with difficulty in the humblest ranks. Three years after the publication of Marlowe's 'Lucan', he placed his name on two insignificant pamphlets on current events, and thenceforward for a dozen years his name reappeared annually on one, two, or three volumes. Altogether Thorpe was associated with the issue of twenty-nine volumes. After 1614 his operations were very few and ceased altogether in 1634. He seems to have ended his days in poverty, and is believed to have been the Thomas Thorpe who was granted an alms-room in the hospital of Ewelme, Oxon, on December 3rd., 1635.

For a short period in 1608 he occupied a shop, "The Tiger's Head" in St. Paul's Churchyard, but he never was in a position to print his copy at a press of his own, or to sell books on his own premises, though he was a procurer of MSS. for a longer period than any other known member of the Stationers' Company. Nevertheless between 1605 and 1611 some eight volumes of genuine literary value were issued under his auspices, including, besides the Sonnets, three plays by Chapman¹, four by Ben Jonson, and Coryate's² "Odcombian Banquet." Most of his publications would no doubt be obtained from a scriverer's hiring for some small sum.

* * * *

Thorpe desired for a 'Mr. W. H.' who possibly occupied a similar position to that of Edward Blount of the 'Lucan' dedication, "all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living Poet."

"Not marble; nor the gilded monument

Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme."

It was 'happiness' or 'eternity' or an equivalent paraphrase, which had a wide vogue amongst the dedicators of the period, and whereby they besought the favour of a patron. Three dedications by Thorpe are extant subsequent to 1609. One of them—and they all prefaced John Healey's "Epictetus his Manuall"—is addressed to John Florio and the other two to the Earl of Pembroke. These two were chosen as patrons of Healey's unprinted MSS. because they had been his patrons before his emigration to Virginia, and early death there. Incidentally Alfred Dodd sees in 'TT' the symbol for the Two Pillars of Masonry, and states that these are to be found between the feet of the Shakespeare Monument in Westminster Abbey.

Sir Sidney Lee says W. H. is best identified with a stationer's assistant, William Hall, who was professionally engaged, like Thorpe, in procuring 'copy', and that his initials only are given because he was an intimate associate, and was known by those initials to their common circle of friends.

¹George Chapman. (1559-1634) Wrote many plays, but his great work is his translation of Homer: he also translated from Petrarch, and completed Marlowe's unfinished "Hero and Leander."

²Thomas Coryate or Coryatt. (1577-1617) Poet. Born at Odcombe, Somerset. Was a great traveller, and after a journey to Greece, Egypt and India, died at Surat.

It has been roughly estimated that in Jacobean days one in twelve persons had a surname beginning with H., and one in eight males bore the baptismal name of William, so that at least one person in every hundred possessed the initials 'W.H.', thus providing plenty of scope for conjecture.

This William Hall is a fairly familiar figure in literary history. From 1577 to 1584 he was apprenticed to the printer and stationer, John Alede, and in the latter year was admitted to the freedom of the Stationers' Company. For the following twenty-two years he appears to have acted as assistant to a master-stationer. In 1906 Hall had obtained for publication a collection of pious poems, 'A foure-fold Meditation' generally regarded as the work of Robert Southwell, to which Hall as owner of the copy had affixed a dedicatory epistle under his initials, W. H. The printer of the volume was the George Eld, who also printed the Sonnets, and it was sold by an insignificant bookseller, Francis Burton. Of the poems W. H. wrote, "Long have they lien hidden in obscuritie, and haply had never seene the light, had not a meere accident conveyed them to my hands." Hall chose as the patron of the venture a Mathew Saunders, Esq., and to the dedicatory epistle prefixed a conventional salutation wishing the 'Right Worshipfull and Vertuous Gentleman long life and prosperity.'¹

¹A Letter in the "Athenaeum" (Nov. 1. 1873) by Mr. Charles Edmonds, for the first time suggested the identity of W. H., the dedicator of Southwell's poem, with Thorpe's 'Mr. W. H.'

(to be continued)

New Publications

Prices (including
British postage)

R. L. EAGLE

BACON OR SHAKESPERE

2/11

A guide to the Problem

EDWARD D. JOHNSON

WILL SHAKESPEARE OF
STRATFORD

3/11

FRANCIS BACON OF ST. ALBANS

3/11

MRS. B. POGSON

IN THE EAST MY PLEASURE LIES

9/6

ROMEO AND JULIET

3/-

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL

3/-

M. A. WITNEY

FRANCIS BACON

2/8

All our publications of great interest to Baconian students

TOWARDS A MORE CORRECT BIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS BACON

(Extracts from an Essay by the late Parker Woodward)

IV

"Complaintes" 1591/2

A BOOK of verse in the "Spenser" rhythm and "Spenser" name was published early in this year. One of the poems, "Ruines of Time", is dedicated to Sidney's sister, Lady Mary, Countess of Pembroke. In this, the spirit of "Verlame" mourns the deaths of several of Francesco's relations—viz, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Henry Sidney and his wife, and the Earl of Warwick.

Verulam city (Verulamium) was the Roman site of St. Albans, and Francis in later years took the title of Baron Verulam. Lady Mary Pembroke was a poetess, but was not happily married. In the name of "Greene" Francis seems to have printed an elegy on the death of Sir Christopher Hatton, which he dedicated to his friend Lady Elizabeth Hatton, daughter of Burleigh's eldest son, Sir Thomas Cecil. The play of "King John" was printed anonymously in 1592, and the old Court comedy "Endimion" was also published, title-paged to "Lyly." The euphuistic romance "Robert, Duke of Normandy," and "Catheros", a satire, were title-paged to "Lodge", and a serious pamphlet, "Farewell to Folly", was printed in the name of "Greene."

The Demise of "Greene"

Robert Greene actually died on 10th July, 1592, at Abbye, an obscure vicarage in Norfolk. Francis may have improved the occasion with a series of pamphlets—viz., "Groatsworth of Wit," "Repentance of Robert Greene," and "Greene's Vision," Greene's literary death was fixed as 4th September, 1592.

The Marprelate battle having drifted into quietude Francis apparently started a friendly controversy with his old tutor, Gabriel Harvey, having for its object the furtherance of public interest, as far as possible, in the printed word. People of his period, generally speaking, were in a mental slough, and had to be taught to think. There was nothing like controversy for interesting and sharpening their brains.

The new controversy was commenced with "A Quip for an Upstart Courtier" (G), and then ran on in pamphlets between Harvey and probably Francis masquerading as "Nash".

The Demise of "Euphues"

When Francis, while writing as "Euphues" in 1580, was ordered to live at Gray's Inn and study law, instead of "studies of greater delight", he added a few significant words to "Euphues his England":

"This letter dispatched, Euphues gave himselfe to solitarinesse, determined to sojourne in some uncouth place until time might turne white salt into fine white sugar, for surely he was both tormented in body and grieved in minde. And so I leave him neither in Athens nor elsewhere that I know. But this order he left with his friendes, that if any newes came, or letter, that they should direct them to the Mount of Silexedra where I leave him eyther to his musings or Muses."

Gray's Inn stands on high ground with a sharp sort of valley between it and the City of London. "Silexedra" would mean "stone cell."

The next round in the "Euphues" game was "Euphues his censure to Philautus, 1587, compiled from some loose papers found in his cell" (C). Next came "Menaphon," or "Camilla's Alarum to Slumbering Euphues in his Melancholic cell at Silexedra," 1589 (G). Then came the 1590 "Spenser" reference to our pleasant Willy (Lyly), who preferred to remain in "idle cell".

But that same gentle Spirit from whose pen
Doth rather choose to sit in idle cell
Than so himselfe to mockerie to sell.

In the second or 1592 edition of "Rosalynde," fathered on Lodge who was at that date again at sea, the title-page runs:

"Rosalynde. Euphues Golden Legacy found after his death in his cell at Silexedra" "Fetcht from the Canaries by T. L. Gent."

As Lodge went to the Canaries before Leicester's death in 1588, it seemed advisable to maintain the assumption of Philautus (Leicester) being still alive. A schedule to the dedicatory pages purports to be an extract from "Euphues last Will and Testament," whereby he bequeaths the tale of "Rosalynde" to the sons of "Philautus" and "Camilla". It is signed "Euphues dying to live". A booklet "Euphues Shadow," entitled to Lodge, then at sea, and purporting to be edited by Greene, completed the sequence. In this interesting way Francis seems to have dropped out as "Euphues".

The Demise of "Watson"

Having quitted the printers ink world as "Greene" and "Euphues" Francis next proceeded to die as "Watson." First publishing a few verses entitled "Tears of Fancie" as "Watson", he added in November to the "Watson" publications a Latin poem "Aminte Gaudea." This poem he dedicated to Mary, Countess of Pembroke. He signed the dedication C.M., thus introducing his new assistant, the player Christopher Marlowe, to the reading public. Judging by Kyd's letter to the Star Chamber in 1593, Marlowe had recently been taken by Francis into his service, "bearing name to serve my Lord when writing for his players." In "Honor of the Garter," (1593) title-paged to Peele, and

in "Have with you to Saffron Walden," (1596) entitled to Nash, the illusion of "Watson's" existence and demise was sought to be branded into the public mind.

Anthony Bacon

This February, 1591/2, Anthony Bacon returned from serving as an "intelligencer" abroad. After their boyhood together there grew a strong friendship between him and Francis, which endured until Anthony died in 1601. Yet Anthony was becoming almost more French than English owing to his long period abroad (1579-1592). Anthony, on his arrival in England, went to Gorhambury where he stayed with his mother, Lady Anne, until the autumn. The plague broke out in July, and Francis retreated to his country house at Twickenham. He had taken the liberty of not joining the Queen in her "Progress" that August, and had gathered a few friends around him at Twickenham Lodge instead. Francis was too busy to write (he had just done the "Device at Tilt," 17th November), but on 28th November deputed his friend Gosnold to write and say to Anthony that he, Francis, would be glad to put him up at Gray's Inn if he cared to come.

Francis moved from Twickenham Lodge to Gray's Inn, but in order to spend Christmas away from the plague went on a visit to his second cousin, Sir George Carey and Lady Elizabeth, his wife (daughter of Sir John Spenser, of *Althorpe*), at the Isle of Wight, of which Carey was Governor. He stayed during January with Carey (evidence "Piers Pennilesse," 1592 (N): "I am the plague's prisoner in the country;" "the fear of infection detaineth me with my Lord").

In "Have with you to Saffron Walden" (N), 1596 the author refers to having spent a Christmas and a good while after at the Isle of Wight.

Conflict with the Queen 1592/3

It is almost inevitable that when a junior is much abler than his seniors and is conscious of this, trouble will accrue, and so it did with Francis. Because Anthony Bacon was methodical and kept his brother's papers and drafts in order, and at a later date (when he became secretary to the Earl) was equally careful of the Essex papers, we now know more about the movements of Francis. In January he was at the Isle of Wight; from February to May at Gray's Inn, from June to November mostly at Twickenham, and in December at Hampton Court in attendance on the Queen.

Parliament met in February, 1592/3, and Francis as M.P. for Middlesex took a prominent part in a debate on the subsidies to be voted to the Crown. He was all for not burdening the public shoulders too heavily, and his was the true statesmanlike view. But it greatly offended the Queen, who preferred to have plenty of money in her Treasury whenever she could get hold of it. The Money Bill urged by the Court, was for three subsidies in three years. Francis asked for six years instead of three.

The letters show that Francis held stoutly to his own opinion. He was sorry to offend, but did not withdraw. He had done his duty only. He well knew "the common way to please," but in future he would preserve silence. The Queen was an old woman absolutely spoilt with flattery, but not without occasional motherly feelings. She was offended because Francis would not acknowledge himself wrong or say he would be a good boy in future. The Bill was passed for three subsidies in four years, with a clause declaring that the money given was solely for the War with Spain. Francis, by compelling the Government to meet him, had done little to advance his "suit" with Lord Burleigh. His spirits, however, did not suffer, and in "Piers Penilesse" (note the implication in Penilesse) he chaffed old friend Gabriel Harvey unmercifully. But Treasury supplies to him were evidently cut off or reduced considerably. "If you interfere with my subsidy, I'll interfere with yours" doubtless said the Queen. Another monetary source had consequently to be discovered.

On 16th April, Anthony Bacon wrote urging his mother, Lady Ann, to bestow the whole of her interest in the Marks Estate on Francis. Bear in mind he had already raised with her consent, £1,200 or more upon it. In the course of this letter Anthony shows that both he and his mother knew something about the Francis literary productions. Anthony said:—

"It cannot but be grief to me to see a mind that hath given so sufficient proof of itself in having brought forth many good thoughts for the general to be overburdened and cumbered with care of clearing his particular estate."

To know on what lines Francis was working with regard to poetry and the drama, one has only to turn to "Piers Penilesse" (title-paged to Nash) pages 60 to 90 remembering that the term "poet" at that day included writers of prose. . . .

"To them that demand what fruites the Poets of our time bring forth, or wherein they are able to prove themselves necessarie to the state. Thus I answer: First and formost they have cleaned our language from barbarisme and made the vulgar sort here in London (which is the fountain whose rivers flowe round about England), to aspire to a richer puritie of speech than is communicated with the Commonalty of any Nation under Heaven."

This hard-working young genius was only thirty-two years of age when he wrote those words.

In May another unpleasant incident occurred. The Flemish population in the City of London had a special reservation wherein they were suffered to live, but, in breach of the guild rights of the citizens, they began to open shops.

The citizens were indignant, and procured someone to write a threatening notice, which was pasted on the wall of the Flemings' Chapel. The Flemings appealed to the Star Chamber, who obliged them as members of a friendly State by searching for evidence of the offender. This may have been Francis or his assistant Marlowe.

Anyhow, the searchers found in the rooms where Marlowe and Kyd worked some portions of a letter sent to them to be copied, in which Francis had restated in writing to a friendly Bishop a theological

argument previously used by him. The fragments referred to are in his handwriting. A warrant was issued to arrest Marlowe, but his patron managed to send him out of the way to the house of Tom Walsingham, a rich friend who lived Deptford way.

At the same time a letter of explanation to the Star Chamber was obviously given by Francis to Kyd, the scrivener, to copy, which he did in the crabbed style of the period. Words Kyd could not make out were apparently filled in by Francis Bacon in his own handwriting. The letter apparently satisfied the Star Chamber.

In June while he was away at Deptford, Marlowe was killed in a brawl. It may well have been Francis who published the ballad about him called "The Atheist's Tragedie," signed "Ignoto." The ballad has been especially commended for its ease and quality, far beyond the ballads of the period. Marlowe is reported to have expressed very heretical views as heresy was considered in that day, but the so-called "Marlowe fragments" were probably not his at all. You have only to compare them with what was alleged by the clergyman Barnes about Marlowe's views.

Francis resumed his interrupted literary labours, and printed the euphuistic romance "William Longbard," (L) and "Phillis", a charming set of sonnets put out in Lodge's name, that "Gent" now having returned from his voyage to South America, possibly to occupy the desk vacated by the deceased Marlowe.

In July or later Francis printed a narrative poem of the "Glaucus and Scilla" type called "Venus and Adonis". Had Marlowe lived the dedication might have been signed by him as supposed author of the poem, for the title-page was anonymous. The Earl of Southampton, to whom the poem was dedicated, was Bacon's friend and would have understood the need of a pseudonym. However Greene and Marlowe were dead, and the name selected was "William Shakespeare", serving as a convenient mask for the player Shakspeare who had come from Stratford in 1586 and had reached the position of man-player in the Shoreditch company.

Shakespeare was evidently a useful and amusing actor who, having somehow made enough money, retired early to Stratford-on-Avon to become a money-lender and a dealer in malt, and to live the life of a successful village tradesman. He appears to have written no letter to anyone, and to have left no manuscripts of any kind. The name Shakspeare or Shaxper was expanded later to "Shakespeare" and even "Shake-speare" on the title pages of the Plays and the Sonnets, thus recalling Pallas Athene. It is curious that Francis (who in his younger days had founded the Order of the Helmet, assuming this goddess's attributes of wisdom and invisibility) should be depicted spear in hand opposite a hand shaking a spear in Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*, 1612 (pp. 33/4).

Gabriel Harvey may have been indicating doubts concerning the employment of the Shakspeare mask in his "Sonnet of the Wonderful Year 1593", the year when Marlowe died and "Venus and Adonis" was printed:—

"Weep poules thy Tamburlane voutsafes to die

ENVOIE

The hugest miracle remains behind

A second Shakerley Rash-Swashe to bind".

By Tamburlane he may have meant Marlowe, though the Play at that time was anonymous; and by Shakerley and "the hugest miracle" he could have been sailing rather close to the wind regarding Marlowe's successor as mask or go-between.

On the whole Shakspeare behaved very well. His health, however, was not good, and he died in 1616.

The Secret Society

There is little doubt that Francis formed a secret society for the prosecution of his scheme for the advancement of learning, the maintenance of the established form of religion, and the improvement of manners, morals, arts, and sciences. Proof is essentially difficult to obtain, though overt signs can be collected by watchful care over a number of years. One small proof has not often been recorded in books about Sir Francis—viz., the statement of Bushel, one of his servants, mentioned in Nichol's "Progresses of Elizabeth" at page 192 of the second volume:—

"Let Twitnam Park which I sold in my younger days be purchased if possible for a residence for such deserving people to study in, since I experimentally found the situation of that place much convenient for the trial of my philosophical conclusions expressed in a paper settled to the trust, which I myself had (i.e., would have) put in practice, and settled the same by Act of Parliament if the vicissitudes of fortune had not intervened and prevented it."

So the site of his Solomon's House was at one time intended to be at Twickenham Lodge. One may assume from that statement that his organization (so far as the workers were concerned) had been founded some time before his death, and established at a time when he was a power in the land.

The overt indications of the existence of his secret society crop up in the "Anatomy of Melancholy", again in the reference to "Francis Rosicrosse" by Bishop Wilkins in "Mathematical Magic" 1641, and in the numerical sign of Fra Rosicrosse given in a number of publications for a hundred years after his death. These signs cannot be fully dealt with in this tentative biography, but they help to account for the great silence and mystery concerning Francis over a long period and up to the present day. Twickenham Lodge, with its eighty-seven acres of enclosed park, gardens, lake, and orchards, must have been a very desirable residence.

Under the sobering influence of the plague, Francis seems to have printed this year a solemn exhortation called "Christ's Tears over Jerusalem," which was dedicated, in the name of Nashe, to Lady Carey, his hostess of January.

Minsheu's "Guide into the Tongues" 1617, which is a polygot and encyclopaedic dictionary, was apparently a co-operative undertaking of the Rosicrosse fraternity.

FALSTAFF'S DEATH

by RODERICK L. EAGLE

WHAT oceans of ink, and space in print, have been used up in attempts to explain what Shakespeare really wrote in passages made incomprehensible by the innumerable quarto and folio misprints! There is, for instance, the endless argument over Hamlet's speech (I, 4) about one defect in eminent men ruining all their virtues. And this because the quarto printer in 1604 put "doubt" instead of "dout" so that the crucial lines should read:

The dram of eale
Doth all the noble substance often dout
To his own scandal.

This speech was omitted from the folio text and, to add to the confusion, the old word "eale" is used for "evil," and "often dout" was, owing to a misunderstanding in dictation in the printing shop, set up as "of a doubt." "Dout," meaning "extinguish" is used in *Hamlet* (IV, 7), and in *Henry V* (IV, 2).

Then there is "run-awayes eyes" for "rude dayes eyes" in Juliet's soliloquy which opens III, 2. There should not be any question as to what was intended since the speech itself makes it perfectly clear that, as a lover, she longs for night and darkness. She calls night "civil" in contrast to "rude day."

The third of the three most controversial puzzles occurs in *Henry V* in Mrs. Quickly's description of Falstaff's death. It forms the first of Edwin Reed's *Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms* published in 1902. As there are probably few copies in the libraries of Bacon and Shakespeare students, it will be of interest to call attention to the explanation offered by Edwin Reed, for it appears to be the correct one, and it shows how helpful it is to consult Bacon when such difficulties arise. Reed was anticipated by Dr. Charles Creighton in an article in *Blackwood's Magazine* for March 1889 to which, no doubt, he was indebted.

In the Quarto of *Henry V* (1600) the Hostess says:

"After I saw him fumble with the sheets, and play with flowers, and smile upon his fingers' ends, I knew there was but one way; for his nose was as sharp as a pen. He bade me lay more clothes on his feet; I put my hand into the bed and felt them, and they were as cold as any stone."

In the Folio of 1623 the wording is identical but for the insertion after "sharp as a pen" of the obscure addition "and a Table of greene fields." As this makes nonsense, the commentators naturally got busy, and

Theobald's "and a' babbled of green fields" was accepted as final. It is an ingenious emendation, but as the symptoms of death are taken from the *Prognostica* of the Greek physician Hippocrates, who wrote in the fifth century B.C., is there any clue here as to what Shakespeare intended? Yes, there is, and it is nothing like Theobald's ingenious guess.

Bacon also made use of the *Prognostica* in his *Historia Vitae et Mortis* (1623) giving several points from Hippocrates which Shakespeare omits, for Bacon's work is intended for the *student* of the subject.

Edwin Reed sets out a table of parallelisms between Shakespeare, Bacon and Hippocrates on the six points or signs mentioned in Mrs. Quickly's description. These are:

Fumbling with the sheets	(Shakespeare)
Fumbling with the hands	(Bacon)
Handling the bedclothes awkwardly	(Hippocrates)
Playing with flowers	(Shakespeare)
Clutching and grasping	(Bacon)
Gathering bits of straw or stems of flowers	(Hippocrates)
Smiling upon his fingers' ends	(Shakespeare)
Raising the hand aimlessly to the face	(Hippocrates)
(This symptom is not mentioned by Bacon)	
Nose as sharp as a pen	(Shakespeare)
The nose becoming sharp	(Bacon)
The nose sharp	(Hippocrates)
On a table of green field	(Shakespeare)
The face pallid	(Bacon)
The whole face of a pale green colour	(Hippocrates)
Feet cold as any stone	(Shakespeare)
Coldness of the extremities	(Bacon)
The extremities cold	(Hippocrates)

There can be no doubt that "on a table of green field" is what Shakespeare wrote, and the Folio printers' misreading is no worse than many other typographical blunders which they made.

As the word "Table" is printed in the Folio with a capital letter, it must, of course, be a noun, thus helping to identify the verbal illustration as an heraldic metaphor. What is meant is that Falstaff's nose was as sharp as a pen on a green surface or background.*

When Hippocrates described the pallor that creeps over the face at such a time he used a Greek word which denotes *pale green*—a term appropriate to a dying Greek, for they were rather olive-complexioned as a race. In the Latin translations of the *Prognostica*, previous to the date of the play, twenty-five out of forty-three translators used the word "pallidus". Nine did not translate it at all because they did

* Note that Shakespeare associates a "pen" with the writing surface known then as a "table" (Latin *tabula*). The modern word "tablet", for a writing-pad, is its diminutive.

not understand the use of the Greek word meaning "pale-green" and instead they brought the Greek word from the original into the text.

In Galen's translation he says:

"The ancients assumed that *χλωρός* means merely pale; it is rather the colour of cabbage or lettuce."

So also the famous physician, Cardan:

"The difficulty is what does *χλωρός* mean? It seems to me that it should be interpreted in the sense of the time in which it was used. Who does not know that in Greece the face of a dying man is of a green colour?"

The Greek poetess, Sappho (about 600 B.C.) wrote:

My face is *paler* than the grass;
To die would seem no more.

(Thomas Davidson's translation)

Shakespeare understood the meanings of the peculiar terms used in heraldry. He makes considerable use of them in the plays. A "field" is the surface of an escutcheon. Edwin Reed quotes the following two instances of Shakespeare's use of "field" in the heraldic meaning:

This silent war of lilies and of roses,
Which Tarquin viewed in her fair face's field.

Lucrece

When forty winters shall besiege thy brow
And dig deep trenches in thy beauty's field.

Sonnet 2

Reed's conclusion is that "Bacon and Shakespeare quoted the same presages of death from Hippocrates; quoted them in the same order, and probably from the same Latin translation." The traditionalists will, however, cling to "a'babbed of green fields," though if Falstaff had babbled of anything it would have been of London taverns and sack, not the countryside. The Shakespeare of "small Latin and less Greek" (words torn from their context to give a meaning far from the intended one) is necessary for the maintenance of the Stratford myth.

Tradition has a hypnotic effect which commands blind belief, an instinctive recoil from any new departure, and an unwillingness to listen to reasoned argument.

DID FRANCIS BACON DIE IN 1626?

Some remarks on and a translation of a part of Dr. H. A. W. Speckman's booklet, *Francis Bacon und sein Tod in Stuttgart im Jahre 1647*. Metz & Margussen, Hanover.

By COUNT L. L. DE RANDWYCK

AFTER the First World War, Dr. Speckman, a Dutchman, went to Germany to establish the real date of Francis Bacon's death. But before discussing Bacon's death, I want to give some information about Joh. Val. Andreae (1586-1654), the author of the correspondence with the Princes of Luneburg.

Andreae studied at Tübingen and was appointed as pastor at Vaihingen, Kalw and Stuttgart. He had been tutor to young noblemen such as the sons of the Duke Augustus of Luneburg, who wrote under the pseudonym Gustavus Selenus. Andreae was author of several books, as for instance "Christianapolis", wherein he disclosed the same ideas as Bacon in his "Nova Atlantis". He was on friendly terms with the Duke Augustus of Luneburg, who became Duke of Brunswick and Wolfenbüttel in 1634, and Bacon. The extensive correspondence in which he honoured the Duke as his patron and benefactor, was edited by Andreae in the later years of his life.

Andreae had been tutor to the Princes of Luneburg, the sons of the Gustavus Selenus mentioned above. When the education was finished, an extensive correspondence began between Andreae and his former pupils. More than 400 letters were exchanged between 1643 and 1649, which were edited by Andreae under the title:

*Joh. Val. Andreae domus Augustae Selenianae princ.
juventutis, utriusque sexus, pietatis, eruditionis
comitatusque exemplum. Ulm. 1654.*

In the edition of the year 1649 the title is "Augustalia Seleniana incepta".

These letters were written with reference to literature, theology and personal affairs. Andreae himself was well versed in the cryptography of Gustavus Selenus; he was the author of a booklet on this subject, which he presented to his former pupils.

In February 26th, 1647, Andreae wrote to them that he had bought a house in Stuttgart, to which he had given the name of Domus Seleniana. Now it is very astonishing that Dr. Speckman found a letter to all the Princes, dated December 22nd, 1647, wherein the content was quite different from all others.

After this introduction I come to my real purpose, the translation of a part of Dr. Speckman's booklet. The letter deals only with one

particular personality, who had not been mentioned in the other letters and who must have been *well known to the Princes*. It contains a complete biography of a friend, whose life ended in Andreae's house in Stuttgart on December 18th, 1647, and *who was a highborn and learned person of great fame*.

The original Latin text of the letter, from which the prayer for the welfare of the House of Luneburg and the wish for divine blessing for the Princes are omitted, is translated as follows:

Serene Brothers, Princes and Lords,
who have been gracious to me so long.

In our house died on December 18th Paulus Jenischius, a greyhead advanced in years, who reached the first half of his 90th year and was born long ago in Antwerp on June 17th, 1558.

A man of many-sided knowledge in literature and languages, with exceptional musical talent, author of a "Seelenschatz", not infamous, but one who through envy and intrigues bore the guilt and penalty of others, and even a *banishment* of more than fifty years.

With uninterrupted peace of mind, corporal fitness, good appetite and sound sleep, he reached this age with pious thoughts, musical relaxation, and manual labour.

He was father of 19 children (books?) four of whom survived him; an uncommon man, during 40 years a true friend of mine, in the full possession of his faculties, only severely suffering in his last year from an ulcer in one of his feet. This caused him much pain, but was endured with submission.

A man to whom success was provided abundantly at first, when fate dealt ruthlessly with him, he steeled his strength by untiring study and labour to protect his good name against slander, a name more esteemed in foreign countries than his own.⁽¹⁾

For many years he had planned his own epitaph and had carried it out in beautifully painted characters, a skilfulness in which he was very experienced. In this epitaph he confirmed the sincerity of his creed and his innocence of the pretended crimes for which he had to suffer. After his quiet labour and laborious repose may he pass away to eternity in blessed peace.

Stuttgart, December 22nd, 1647.

Your obedient Servant,

JOH. VAL. ANDRAE.

Without doubt many of his contemporaries in his native country as well as in that of his banishment could have given evidence of the high position he had before his fall, and of his knowledge and his hardworking life.

However it was very remarkable that of such a personality, with the name of Paulus Jenischius (born in Antwerp), not a single trace was to be found. Dr. Speckman consulted all the biographical dictionaries but *no one knew him except Joh. Val. Andreae*.

There exists a *Dictionnaire Critique* by Petrus Bayle. In the first edition of 1697 the name of Jenischius is not to be found. In the second edition the name of Paulus Jenischius is mentioned, but Bayle remarks that he refers to the 190th letter of Andreae in his *Augustalia Seleniana*, the name of Paulus Jenischius being quite unknown to the authors of biographies in the Netherlands. Moreover his translation of the 190th letter was incorrect, because many important matters were not mentioned, while inventions were added.

(1) Did not Bacon use this expression in his will? Translator's Note.

The name of this personality was not only unknown in the Netherlands though Holland was at that time the refuge for the exiles from the whole world, but it was also unknown in Germany, notwithstanding that Jenischius died at Stuttgart, as is pointed out by Andreae.

In none of the *German Biographies* is this Paulus Jenischius to be found. H. Witte (1634-1695), who wrote a *Diarium biographicum* and studied at twenty universities, did not know him.

Paulus Freher (1611-1682), a physician in Bamberg, who wrote a *Theatrum virorum eruditione clarorum* did not know him.

G. C. Jocher in his "Gelehrten Lexicon" (1733) and A. Moreni in his *Grand Dictionnaire* (1740 Vol. V) mention the name of this Jenischius, but they tell us very clearly that they refer to the *Dictionnaire Critique*, second edition, by P. Bayle, who used Andreae's 190th letter.

After further inquiry it appeared that a man of the name of Paulus Jenischius really existed, but was quite another person than Andreae's friend and *can not be confounded with this one.* In his *Theatrum virorum eruditione clarorum*, Noribergia, 1688, p. 541, P. Freher mentioned that this Paulus Jenischius had been born in Augsburg on October 25th, 1602. In 1620 he studied theology at the University of Jena and went later to Leipzig, Wittenberg and Altdorf, where he took the degree of Magister in 1625. He finished his studies in Strasbourg; he married Regina Reiserer by whom he had eleven children, five of them surviving him.

Finally he became Dean of the Lutheran Church at Augsburg. When he received on November 2nd, 1648, the tidings of the Peace of Westphalia, he said: "Now I am happy to die". He died on November 14th, 1648, at the age of 46 years.

This "Jenischius" from Freher cannot be the "Paulus" from Andreae. No intelligent person would take the one for the other. The Jenischius born in 1602 at Augsburg, cannot be the same as the Jenischius born in 1558 at Antwerp.

We must therefore conclude that Andreae intended to deceive us of *malice prepense*, that his biography of Paulus is substantially correct, that errors have been inserted intentionally, and that Jenischius was not the real name. Andreae could do this with impunity, because the real Jenischius died on November 14th, 1648, and so it was not possible for him to protest against the abuse of his name, when Andreae published his letter in 1649, and 1654.

Who then was the man, whom Andreae really meant? None else than Francis Bacon, about whom Andreae gave some information in his letter to the Princes of Luneburg. Except Francis Bacon there is nobody whom this biography would suit. Andreae tells us, that Paulus was born on June 17th, 1558, at Antwerp; this is a fake, Jenischius not being an English name nor was there a learned person in England of this name.

Francis Bacon was born on January 22nd, 1560/61. In his later years he was made Viscount St. Alban. St. Alban being the name of a Christian saint, born at Verulam, who died as a martyr in 287. June

17th is St. Alban's day and this day was mentioned as the birthday of our Jenischius.

The number 190, or 19 with a zero, points to the letter *T*. or to the Book *T*, *Thesaurus animarum*, *T*. being the 19th letter of the alphabet in Queen Elizabeth's time. The year of his birth is given as 1558, the sum of the numbers being 19 too. According to the rules of the Kabala this sum may be deducted from the original number, thus $1558 - 19 = 1539$ or 19×81 . Here is the number 19 again, the Book *T.*, and 81, an important cypher for the Rosicrusians.⁽¹⁾

Andreae considers the real reason for Bacon's banishment to be the envy and the guilt of other persons, this being confirmed by the letter of Thomas Bushell to his friend John Elliot. (BACONIANA, April, 1917, and May, 1955.)

Finally some personal remarks. When I read Dr. Speckman's booklet for the first time, it struck me that a direct reason for the identity of Bacon was given only in the date of his birth.

After many years I saw suddenly the real meaning of the cyphers 19 and 81 namely, that their sum is a hundred, the well known cypher of Francis Bacon, as is indicated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 6.17.1.13.3.9.18. & 2.1.3.14.13. & = 100 \\ \text{FRANCIS} & \text{BACON} & \end{array}$$

This cypher is found too in an epigram by Marston:

Far fly thy name,
Most most beloved, whose *silent name*
one letter bounds.

This letter is the Roman *C.*, as for instance, the first *C.* in the word COVERCAME in Don Adriana's Letter in *Love's Labour's Lost*. (Act IV). The Stratfordians consider this letter a printer's mistake, though it is of the most important meaning, as is explained in Mr. Edward Johnson's booklet, *Don Adriana's Letter*. This *C.*, stands in the corner of a large square with sides of ten smaller squares, 10×10 making 100.

If any reader is of another opinion than Dr. Speckman, I hope he will mention the person, who, in his opinion, is concealed under the name of Paulus Jenischius, born at Antwerp, 1558.

(1) I may point to the Sonnet 81 in which Bacon addresses his pseudonym Shakespeare. Translator's Note.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "Daily Telegraph"

WHAT SHAKESPEARE LOOKED LIKE NO RELIABLE PORTRAIT

Dear Sir,

The only "portrait" of Shakespeare, which is assumed to bear some resemblance to him is that by Droeshout prefixed to the Folio of the Plays published in 1623 seven years after his death.

It is a grotesque drawing. I can never understand how any unprejudiced person with a sense of humour can look upon it without being tempted to irreverent laughter. As Droeshout was only 15 years of age when Shakespeare died and 12 at the date at which he had finally retired to Stratford it is most improbable it was drawn from life.

How very unsatisfactory it is that this woodeny thing, with its hydrocephalous forehead, straight dark hair bunched over the ears, and idiotic stare, should do duty as the "counterfeit presentment" of the world's greatest poet.

In 1883, Dr. C. M. Ingleby, an eminent Shakesperean authority, advocated the exhumation of Shakespeare's remains to settle the question of what "portrait," if any, might bear a resemblance to the original. Although the vicar gave his assent the Mayor and Corporation, as lay rectors, refused theirs, and so the attempt was in vain.

A great deal more can be achieved today by scientific methods than was possible in 1883, and much valuable and extremely interesting information could be obtained as to Shakespeare's appearance, height, and the rest.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.

Sir,

Mr. R. L. Eagle, writing on what Shakespeare looked like, is a little wide of the mark when he states that the only "portrait" assumed to bear some resemblance to the Bard is that by Droeshout. This grotesque drawing is not the only assumed portrait.

Of far greater importance is the elaborate monument erected to Shakespeare's memory in the chancel of the Church of the Holy Trinity at Stratford by the tomb maker, Gerard Johnson. Although classic in design, it has the sobriety of a Dutch interpretation and the bust, above the Latin inscription, has a realism that suggests the use of a death mask for the model.

As the monument was erected shortly after Shakespeare's death and bearing in mind the then prevailing fashion of realism in sculpture as well as painting, it can be assumed that the bust is the most authentic memorial of the poet's features now in existence.

Yours faithfully,

R. DUMONT-SMITH.

East Croydon, Surrey.

BUST OF THE BARD

Sir,

May I reply to Mr. R. Dumont-Smith that I made no reference to the bust of Shakespeare in the Church at Stratford as it is unreliable?

In 1748-9 after the monument had been described as "much impaired and decayed," John Hall (a local "limner") was given a free hand in "repairing and beautifying" it. The work took several months and was obviously extensive.

There are only two known drawings of the monument and bust prior to 1748, and they show a very different face, and position of arms and hands. The figure is not shown in the act of writing. The design of the monument itself is also widely at variance with that seen today.

Dugdale in his "History of the Antiquities of Warwickshire," published in 1656, shows a drawing of the original monument and so does Nicholas Rowe in his edition of the Plays in 1709.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.

Falmouth

Sir,

Why will Mr. R. L. Eagle and anti-Stratfordians in general persist in their theory of Shakespeare's monument in Stratford Church being deliberately altered in the mid-18th century?

Leaning on Dugdale to support this theory Mr. Eagle is on very unsure ground, as any authority on Jacobean architecture and design will readily agree that the Shakespeare bust as it stands to-day is purely and simply the work of an early 17th century sculptor.

Is Dugdale in his "History of the Antiquities of Warwickshire" accurate in reproductions of other monuments in Stratford Church? Compare the canopied monument to Sir George Carew and his wife to the illustration in Dugdale, and one will realise the discrepancies are far and away greater than in the monument to Shakespeare.

The drawings in Dugdale are a travesty in every detail. Why, with his inaccuracies as to the Carew monument, are we to accept him as accurate in his reproduction of the Shakespeare monument?

Yours faithfully,

EDGAR WYARD,

Lostock, Lancs.

Sir,

Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare published in 1744 contains an illustration of the mural monument in Stratford to the poet, engraved by H. Gravelot.

This illustration is therefore earlier than 1748, but it shows that the monument was then very much as it is today. The main difference is in the face, which is not so full and sleek and has more hair and beard. It is more like the Chandos portrait.

Yours faithfully,

(Rev.) E. G. BENSON,

Presteigne, Radnorshire.

The Editor,

"The Daily Telegraph and Morning Post."

ALTERED TOMB

Sir,

Mr. R. L. Eagle's letter, with the interesting picture from Dugdale's "Warwickshire," shows clearly that the original bust of Shakespeare was quite different to the present one; and as Mr. Eagle rightly claims, Dugdale's illustration is confirmed in Rowe's Shakespeare in the editions of 1709 and 1714. The death mask theory therefore seems to be "busted."

Can anyone throw light on the question why this particular tomb has been fundamentally changed? Sir William Dugdale was a noted antiquary and Nicholas Rowe was a Poet Laureate. Neither of them was likely to mistake a sack of malt or wool for a pen and tablet.

If such liberties have really been taken with the figure, can we place any reliance on the rather heavy features of the present face? If we compare the existing likeness and portraits of the Bard, it seems we have enough variety to suit the taste of any intending purchaser.

Yours faithfully,

MARTIN PARES.

London, S.W.3.

Sir,

Mr. Edgar Wyard is unjust to Dugdale in charging him with consistent inaccuracies. He instances the Carew monument at Stratford. It so happens that Dugdale did not sketch this as the drawing was supplied by the Carew-Clopton family. He only drew those monuments on his tour which could not be provided by the families for various reasons. *Dugdale's notebook with the sketches he himself made, is preserved by the Dugdale family at Merevale Hall, Warwickshire, and it includes the Shakespeare monument, but not that of Carew.* In general, Dugdale is accurate as a draughtsman.

Can any reasonable person believe that Sir William Dugdale, engaged in the preparation of a great work, could copy the effigy of Shakespeare as it now stands and produce a figure so preposterously unlike his model and so excite the jeers and laughter of all Warwickshire men, and of all visitors to the Church?

I am well acquainted with the engraving by Gravelot in Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare in 1744 to which the Rev. E. G. Benson refers me. This was copied with some variations, from Vertue's engraving prefixed to Pope's edition of 1725. Vertue did not go to Stratford but to Rowe and, finding the engraving in that edition of the plays to be so very inartistic, he *improved* the monument and effigy making it appropriate for a poet, and copying the so-called Chandos portrait for the head!

Those engaged in "beautifying" the monument in 1748-9 had a convenient guide in Gravelot's published idealized representation. In the 18th century the painters and sculptors did not trouble about accuracy, or even honesty, with regard to Shakespeare. They set about to supply what was wanted.

I am Sir,

Yours obediently,

R. L. EAGLE.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The words in italics were omitted by the "Daily Telegraph".

Letters from the Mailbag:

MR. SHAKESPEARE

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I was greatly amused by the article you reprinted on Shakespeare's "poor" plays. The amount of vicious reasoning that can be suggested by the problem of the authorship is simply amazing. If "The Merry Wives" exclude a careful and cultured playwright, they must exclude the author of "Hamlet" and "Coriolanus", to mention two of the many ways in which culture (within the limits of that time) cannot be denied. A cultured man, even when pressed by the necessities of potboiling will hardly degenerate below certain standards.

Whatever the reasoning, sane or otherwise, the reasoners are bound to come a cropper. Facts are stubborn things that will elude the artificial canons of "thought". By the way, one of these stubborn facts is that a number of clear, self-proving masonic seals, perfected "to a degree" and inserted into the play, ascribe "The Merry Wives of Windsor" to Bacon and Marlo (a spelling found on contemporary title-pages). As that type of masonic seal is based on incontrovertible scientific principles—even in the 20th century a national bank could do no better to authenticate its notes—I am content to abide by what the worthy craftsmen themselves have confessed "on the square" and prudently repudiate all dangerous "reasoning".

The Marlowe angle incites me to congratulate the brilliant and much publicized Mr. Hoffman, who happened to clasp the little finger of truth and thought he was hugging that slippery person. Only when he has stumbled upon half a dozen other avatars of the catholic Shakespeare will he be treading near the heels of truth, if I may borrow an expression used (*sub rosa*) about the mysterious Shakespeare entity itself, by a well-informed contemporary.

PIERRE HENRION.

Versailles, Sept. 17, 1956.

(The above is a letter published by the "New York Herald Tribune" under the date 20th Sept. 1956).

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

NORTHUMBERLAND MANUSCRIPT

Looking at the illustration of the Northumberland Manuscript contained in Mr. Howard Bridgewater's pamphlet "Evidence connecting Sir Francis Bacon with Shakespeare", I notice that if the manuscript be turned upside down the inscription

"your sovereign
ffrauncis"

may be plainly but inconspicuously seen. It is also significant that the name "ffrauncis" has been inserted between the names of the deposed kings Richard II and Richard III. I have not seen this referred to in recent Baconian publications, but it seems to me to afford valuable sixteenth century evidence in favour of Bacon's royal parentage and claim to the throne. As the writing in the manuscript states,

"revealing day through every crany peepes".

Yours faithfully,

H. N. THOMAS.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

THE STRATFORD "SHAKESPEARE" MONUMENT

The Stratfordians contend that the monument as it is now is the original made by Gerald Janssen when Shakspeare died, but this is not true as there is definite proof that the Bust as we see it to-day is a new one made after the year 1709, the date of Rowe's engraving.

If your readers will look at the Bust they will see an upturned moustache with a space between the moustache and the base of the nose, and a similar space between the moustache and the upper lip of the mouth; in fact the moustache looks as if it were a false one gummed on. Now we all know that if a man does not shave the hair of the moustache it begins to grow at the base of the nose and continues down to the upper lip of the mouth. A search of the Prints Department of the British Museum has failed to disclose any print or engraving of any Englishman alive in 1616, when Shakspeare died, wearing a moustache similar to that shown in the present Stratford Bust, and it is not until we come to *the days of Charles II* that we can find an illustration of a moustache similar to that shown in the Bust. This style of moustache was of *foreign* origin and was adopted by Charles II's courtiers. If Shakspeare ever wore such a moustache, it is very strange that it appears in the Stratford Bust *only* and *nowhere else*, and that there is not a single portrait of Shakspeare in existence depicting him wearing such a one. It is submitted that this proves conclusively that the present Bust is different from that which was originally placed on the Stratford monument, and that it is of a later date, namely 1748 or 1749, when the original was discarded and the new monument put up.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

The two articles in your June, 1956 issue, concerning the portrait of Elizabeth and the name of Shakespeare, provoked a few thoughts which I will pass along for what they are worth. My authority on definitions is Funk & Wagnall's *Standard Dictionary*, 1929 edition.

Professor Henrion's discussion of the symbolism of the portrait of Elizabeth is excellent. However, if the child in the centre of the picture is meant to be Bacon, perhaps we should look for more in his hands than the "ears of corn" and "rudder", symbolizing peace and the helm of state. A provincial English use of "shack" was the grain shed from the ear, as at harvest. A "spear" is a stalk

of wheat. Our modern word "shock", for sheaves of grain, probably derives from the old use of "shack".

Thus we have Bacon (if this is Bacon), holding in his right hand "shack" and "spears", being the grain itself and the stalks of grain.

Perhaps more than one connotation is intended. Suppose we take the grain in the right hand and the rudder, rudder post, and tiller in the left. Another provincial English use of "shack" is a low, itinerant beggar. A "spar" is a stick of wood, particularly used with reference to any timber used on a ship. Thus we have "shack", the grain, and also signifying a low, shiftless fellow; and "spar" the rudder post.

The rudder is more of a problem, except that to it is attached a tiller. Perhaps the rudder is there only to identify the tiller, since it would be hard to tell what the tiller is without the rudder. Now, a "tiler" is the doorkeeper of a Masonic society who guards the lodge from without.

We wonder why the other child is holding a palm. "Palm" as a verb means to hide in the palm of the hand, to impose fraudulently. And also "To conceal, as a birth".

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS P. LEARY.

Nebraska, U.S.A., August 19th, 1956.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

"Sooner or later", say the wishful thinkers, "the original MSS. of the plays will be found, perhaps in somebody's tomb or in Masonic or Rosicrucian archives."

My belief, which surely must be shared by all who have any faith in Mrs. Gallup, is that if any original MS. survives, someone must have forgotten to destroy it.

One has only to put oneself in the position of Bacon as he prepared to enfold hidden messages in his writings by the means he planned. The obvious and logical and certainly the simplest way of tackling the work was to mark the MS. so that the type compositor or a secretary directing the type compositor could ensure the correct choice of font for each letter.

It would have been relatively easy, especially in those days, for the half encyphered messages on the MS. to be de-coded.

In view of Bacon's avowed terror of discovery, the continued existence of such marked MSS. would have been considered dangerous. Once the plays and other works were in print there was no need for their preservation—but there was an urgent and definite need to get rid of them as soon as they had served their purpose.

But, of course, those Baconians who discredit Mrs. Gallup and disbelieve in the cypher, can still live in hope that some future salvage drive will unearth the MSS., with or without marks of encypherment!

Yours faithfully,

D. W. PRICE.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

The Stratfordians contend that the man who wrote the Sonnets was Will Shakspeare of Stratford and that he was also the author of the "Shakespeare" Plays. There are certain passages in the Sonnets which disprove this.

In Sonnet III is the line "Thence comes it that my name received a Brand"; a brand means a stigma, or mark of infamy; that is, to be convicted of crime.

In Sonnet 88 is the line, "Of Faults concealed wherein I am attainted". Attainted means to receive a sentence of outlawry by a legal tribunal involving the extinction of civil rights.

In Sonnet 125 is, "Hence, thou suborn'd Informer—a true soul when most impeach'd stands least in thy control". To "impeach" is to accuse a man before a tribunal of *official misconduct*, and impeachment is the arraignment of a public officer for malfeasance in office, and especially the exceptional form of process whereby the House of Commons obtains redress for higher crimes and misdemeanours committed by *Peers* and ministers of the Crown.

The reputed author of the Sonnets, Will Shakspeare, (1) never received a

rand or was convicted of crime, (2) never suffered attainder and the extinction of civil rights, and (3) was never impeached. A *commoner* could not be impeached, neither did any suborned informer bear false witness against him; therefore the author of the Sonnets was not Will Shakspeare.

The only author of the era who was (1) convicted of crime, (2) attainted, and (3) impeached, and whose fall was due to the suborned informer Churchill, was Francis Bacon who wrote the Sonnets and the immortal Plays, under the mask of "William Shakespeare".

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

The unknown child in the French picture published in your last issue, who is in the shadow, may well be Admiral Thomas Seymour's child by Princess Elizabeth, when she was staying with Queen Catherine Parr at Hatfield. There was some trouble at the time, and the Admiral was sent to the Tower of London by his brother, the Lord Protector, in the reign of Edward VI.

Yours faithfully,

NIGEL HARDY.

Dear Sir,

Among my collection is a copy of "The Cypher of Roger Bacon" which was purchased about four years ago. That was my first knowledge of Dr. Newbold's discovery of microscopic writing in the Voynich MSS. I have been in correspondence with a member of the Intelligence relative to the hidden figures I had found in the originals of Bacon's works.

After I had read Newbold's book, I mentioned the fact to him, and here is his reply:—

"In your letter you refer to Newbold's *The Cypher of Roger Bacon* and say that 'What I learned from his book convinced me that my theory is substantially sound'. It is unfortunate that you should regard Newbold's work as authoritative in any respect. I invite your attention to the following brochure by John M. Manly;

"Roger Bacon and the Voynich Manuscript", Speculum Cambridge, Mass., July, 1931, Vol. 6, pp. 345-391.

In his scholarly study Manly completely demolishes Newbold's work, which, according to Manly, must be regarded as wholly subjective. This is certainly the case in respect to the microscopic "shorthand" characters into which Newbold "decomposed" the individual "letters" of the writings in the Voynich MSS. I carefully checked Manly's work, too, and corroborated all his findings. It is true that the decipherment or interpretation of the writings in the Voynich manuscript has thus far eluded all scholars. Two investigators other than Newbold have fancied that they had achieved a solution, but I assure you that their "solutions" are also entirely subjective. Some day, no doubt, a valid solution of the writings in the Voynich manuscript will be achieved, but I feel absolutely sure that it will not involve actually finding microscopic characters in the writing as claimed by Newbold".

Clearly my correspondent places no belief in microscopic writing. Although I am interested in ciphers, I am no cryptologist. *With all due respect to the member of Intelligence referred to and Mr. Manly, I believe that Newbold did observe small characters.* The amount of time and patience with which he conducted his experiments must surely have revealed the characters. He used a microscope of about 10 power magnification, and I believe that he did not have the proper instrument to reveal the characters so that others would be capable of observing them. The sense of sight varies in people. Some can observe things finely done, and I believe that he was capable of distinguishing enough characters clearly with the instrument used. When you employ convex lenses of 10 power to observe minute characters, the characters begin to swell and finally lose their identity before they have been most distinctly developed. When Roger Bacon formed these characters, he must have had some optical instrument at his disposal to follow his work. The focal point of the lens or lenses must have been at such a height as to allow the movements of his pen. The same holds true for

Francis Bacon's hidden writings. Now a 10 power lens has a focal point of approximately one inch. This surely is not adequate room for the manipulating of a pen or knife. Therefore, I believe that an instrument must be formed that will have the qualities of good magnification but at the same time have the character to retain its image under this magnification, and that the position of the instrument must be such that there will be manoeuvrability beneath it. I have collected more than 300 lenses of various sizes and shapes and have tried various combinations in an attempt to find the proper one for the microscopic writings. By using a convex lens on top of a meniscus I have been able to sharpen the character and discover more, but not enough for any attempt at translation. Here again, the focal length is about one inch. I realize that the lenses I have been using are modern war surplus equipment. What is needed, I believe, are the types of lenses used in the 16th century. Many of which were parabolical in shape.

Newbold in his book mentions Leonard Digges. Digges compiled a Geometrical and Practical Treatise entitled *Pantometria*, published by his son, Thomas Digges and dedicated to Sir Nicholas Bacon. Leonard Digges constructed a telescope before 1571. From another one of his volumes (never published) we learn of concave and convex glasses, both circular and parabolical in form, used to construct an instrument whereby a letter could be read at a distance as far as the eye could see. I certainly should like to study that book. Perhaps there is some phase of optics that is not in use at the present time and which might be of the utmost importance since Bacon was acquainted with the author. So you see I am acquainted with Newbold's book "Cipher of Roger Bacon", and realize that many of his characters are the same as those I described in the question marks. I hesitated to reveal the above information in my articles, for fear that no one would become interested in searching for them, since Newbold's theory had been officially discredited.

You mentioned in your letter that Francis Bacon's works abound with such references as "The first and last", and "The Alpha and Omega", relating to cyphers. I agree and believe that these references pertain to many kinds of alphabets, and that these alphabets are the Abecedarium of his New Philosophy. It is my belief that once we have found the beginning of Bacon's primary philosophy and work from there we shall progress more rapidly and surely to the entire solution. It appears to me that lenses are the key to the beginning of the solution. You mentioned in your letter that "Bacon had lenses which would enable one to see at great distances, etc." In the *New Atlantis* he devotes several pages to lenses, perspective houses and light, and shadows. In the *Novum Organum* in the Prerogative Instances he lists them as aids to the senses. I do not know of any facsimile of the *Sylva Sylvarum*. I am fortunate in having four original editions not in very good condition: 1635, 1639, 1658, 1669. I think that there were either nine or ten editions published by Dr. Rawley. I have enclosed examples of the characters that make up the question marks, together with the questions that precede them. You will observe that many of them are strange indeed. There are errors, no doubt, for it would be necessary to study each mark minutely to prepare tables for a try at an interpretation.

But I wanted to submit to you some examples to show that there is something unusual in their construction. I employed a lens of about 8 power magnification. An ordinary reading glass will not reveal some of the delicate divisions. Many of the characters though are widely separated. When one reads the question without the rest of the dialogue, in many instances, there seems to be a connection between it and the characters themselves. Sir, these characters are also found in many of the letters that make up the words throughout the plays. I believe that the Folio Edition of the Plays is the greatest piece of work that was ever produced. I cannot accept the conclusions of authorities on printing that say the typography of the Folio is faulty because of the lack of the proper type, and the use of broken type. The use of each piece of type, I believe, has some meaningful purpose, and I hope that we, along with other members of the Society, shall be instrumental in proving it so.

Most sincerely,

"A CORRESPONDENT".